


GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY
CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

CLASS Acc. No 3731

CALL No. 901.0954 Kab

D.G.A. 79.



THE INDIAN HERITAGE

Books by Humayun Kabir

KANT'S 'ON PHILOSOPHY IN GENERAL'

POETRY, MONADS AND SOCIETY

MAHATMA AND OTHER POEMS

MEN AND RIVERS

SCIENCE, DEMOCRACY AND ISLAM

EDUCATION IN NEW INDIA

(In the Press)

THE INDIAN HERITAGE

III

by
HUMAYUN KABIR



901.0954

Kab



ASIA PUBLISHING HOUSE
BOMBAY — CALCUTTA

FIRST PUBLISHED : 1946

SECOND EDITION : 1947

REPRINTED : 1949

THIRD EDITION (REVISED AND ENLARGED)

NOVEMBER 14, 1955

Copyright reserved by author

PRINTED BY N. E. CHINWALLA, MANAGER, BRITISH INDIA PRESS, BOMBAY AND PUBLISHED
BY P. S. JAYASINGHE, ASIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, BOMBAY

Ch 574/1
29.11.55
Bharatiya Sahitya Bhavana

To
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

who
like Asoka and Akbar
has helped to discover and enrich the Indian heritage,
in affectionate admiration

CENTRAL LIBRARY
373/
22. 11. 55.
901.0954/kab.

Preface

AN INVITATION to deliver the Maharaja Sayaji Rao Golden Jubilee Lectures for 1943 served as an incentive to organise and record some thoughts on the unity and continuity of Indian culture. The first two chapters of this book are substantially the same as the lectures delivered and soon after published under that Foundation. I wish to place on record my gratefulness for the honour conferred by Baroda's invitation and the opportunity it offered to stress some aspects of Indian civilisation which are often neglected in our traditional histories.

India is too big a country to be summed up in any simple formula. Her long and chequered history lends itself to diverse and at times contrary interpretations. Complexity and variety are inevitable in so vast and ancient a land and those who seek to stress and perpetuate differences may find sufficient material to justify their stand-point. And yet there is a unity of spirit underlying the multiform manifestations of Indian life.

To the world outside, India is often represented as a stage for the conflict between Hindus and Muslims, and the pomp and pageantry of prince and princeling. They form but a small part of the story recorded here. The omission is not accidental but deliberate. Considering the expanse of the country and the duration of her history, the vastness of the population and the

stringency of their struggle for existence, communal frictions are few and far between while prince and princeling seem but mere bubbles on the surface of Indian life. The record of communal jealousy and conflict pales into insignificance when one thinks of the friendship and kindliness that generally mark the relations of the communities. The pomp and pageantry of the princes fade into nothingness against the background of the silent and massive flow of the dumb and inert masses. In the long run, they and their life alone matter.

The contemporary world is torn with the clash of rival ideas and ideologies. Immediate differences often conceal fundamental needs and ideals. India sought to reconcile differences without suppressing individual points of views. She built up a unity of spirit which has survived without the aid of physical compulsion. We can serve India and humanity best if we seek to discover that unity and base on it our attempts to create a new India out of old values and traditions.

H U M A Y U N K A B I R

22 December, 1946

Preface to the Third Edition

THE RECEPTION given to this brief study in Indian history and culture, originally published under the title *Our Heritage*, has exceeded my fondest expectation. I am keenly aware of its shortcomings and know that many of my suggestions and hypotheses are not included in the accepted historical tradition. Far more detailed study and research than I could undertake will be needed before a final decision on them can be taken. In order to provoke thought and challenge what appear to be mere myths, I have at times expressed my views more categorically than may be warranted by our current information. It is however my conviction that the picture of Indian culture I have attempted to draw is by and large truer to the facts than the story of the conflicts of a few political personalities which so often passes as Indian history. It is my earnest hope that more careful and competent historians will take up the study in greater detail and help in providing a true and comprehensive history of the Indian people.

Many of those who have favoured me with their views have suggested the addition of a new chapter. While they welcomed the emphasis on the process of cultural unification, they felt that a brief account of the political events would be useful to those who are unfamiliar with Indian history. It would have been

impossible within the available time and space to give a full account of the political history of India, but I have tried to supply a bare skeleton of events in an introductory survey. I have also added a brief postscript on some tendencies which have become clear only since independence.

I must however repeat what I said in the preface to the first edition of the book. What matters in Indian history is not the story of the clash and conflict of prince and princeling, but the silent and massive flow of the life of the people which has built and is building up in India a common humanity out of a diversity of races, clans, religions, languages, customs and creeds.

I wish to thank Dr. P. C. Chakravarty for some valuable suggestions with regard to the Introduction. My daughter helped me by checking the dates and reading the proofs. Last but not least, I am grateful to Dr. John Guy Fowlkes for the great interest he has taken in the preparation and production of this edition.


HUMAYUN KABIR

New Delhi

15 *September*, 1955

Contents

<i>Preface to the First Edition</i>	vii
<i>Preface to the Third Edition</i>	ix
INTRODUCTION	I
✓ THE ARYAN SYNTHESIS	39
1. <i>Unity in Diversity</i>	41
2. <i>Geographical Influences</i>	48
3. <i>Socio-Political Interactions</i>	56
4. <i>The Kathak</i>	63
5. <i>Religion and Philosophy</i>	68
MEDIEVAL RECONCILIATION	75
1. <i>The Hindusthani Way</i>	79
2. <i>Economics and Art</i>	89
3. <i>Modes of Outlook</i>	101
MODERN FERMENT	111
1. <i>In the Melting Pot</i>	113
2. <i>The Bifurcation</i>	120
3. <i>Geographical Nationality</i>	128
4. <i>The Conflict</i>	136
5. <i>Eternal versus Momentary</i>	143
6. <i>Art and Literature</i>	147
7. <i>The Young Rebels</i>	153
8. <i>Renaissance and Revivalism</i>	158
POST-SCRIPT	167



Introduction

A BRIEF summary of the political history of India may be helpful in understanding the process of cultural unification which is recorded in this study. Indian history can be traced back to over 5000 years and it is obvious that no adequate account can be given within the compass of a few pages. Even apart from the limitation of space, the time has perhaps not yet come to write a full history of the political and social life of the Indian people. Twenty-five years ago, books on Indian history began their story with the advent of the Aryans. To this day, our knowledge of the period before 600 B.C. is incomplete and sketchy. Nor are the difficulties of the historian confined to the ancient period. We have fairly adequate records of what happened after the Muslims appeared on the scene. Of what has often been described as the British period, the accounts are even more numerous. The events are, however, still too near us to permit an objective and dispassionate study. For the purpose of this book, all that we need is a skeleton of events. It is hoped that this bare record of facts may serve as a frame of reference for those who are not familiar with the story of India.

I

Recent discoveries indicate that round about 3000 B.C.

there was a developed civilisation in the north-western and northern regions of India. Popularly described as the Indus Valley civilisation, we had till recent times evidence of its existence only in Mohenjodaro and Harappa. In the last decade, traces of this civilisation have however been found in the Sutlej Valley, in Jaisalmer in Rajasthan and as far south as Lothal near Ahmedabad. It now seems clear that this ancient civilisation was not confined to the valley of the Indus but had spread east and south across half the Indian sub-continent.

Who the people of Mohenjodaro and Harappa were and where they came from cannot be said with any certainty today. The available remains indicate striking similarities with the people of Sumer, but historians offer different explanations of the similarity. Some are of the view that the civilisation spread westwards from the Indus basin till it reached the banks of the Euphrates and the Tigris. Others hold that it came to India from Sumer. Be that as it may, it had round about 3000 B.C. attained a high degree of maturity. One is thus justified in holding that its beginnings must go back perhaps another 500 years.

/// The Indus Valley civilisation is the first recognisable ingredient in the development of Indian culture. Its influence has persisted to this day and led some historians to declare that it is the true progenitor of modern India. This claim may be exaggerated, but it is the exaggeration of a truth. The historic culture of India has in some important respects deviated from this ancient pattern. The Mohenjodaro civilisation appears to have been primarily urban while Indian life through

the centuries has flowed mainly in rural channels. Traces of its influence however persist in the way of life of the people. Forms of dress, utensils and pottery which are still in use go back to the Mohenjodaro days. It has been suggested that some of the religious beliefs current today—the cult of the mother goddess, the reverence for the cow, and the worship of Siva—date back to this ancient culture.

According to one hypothesis, the most important influence of this civilisation is to be found in the pacifist temper of the Indian people. Aryans in other parts of the world have not been specially remarkable for pacifism. In fact, they have generally been noted for their warlike quality and temper. It may therefore be doubted if the prevalent Indian attitude to war and violence is derived from the Aryans. The people of Harappa and Mohenjodaro seem to have developed a pacifist attitude which according to some historians was one main reason for their defeat at the hands of the Aryans. In the scale of civilisation, the Aryans were perhaps inferior to the people of Mohenjodaro, but their more aggressive character and their superiority in the art of warfare gave them the victory.

As far as is known, the Aryans started coming into India round about 2000 B.C. This was not immigration on a mass scale and there was probably no great movement of peoples. They came in driblets and trickled over many decades, if not centuries, through the mountains that guard the north-western frontiers of India. They were a pastoral people and cattle seem to have been their chief wealth even though their earliest verses contain many references to agriculture. Unlike the

people of Mohenjodaro, they had probably learnt the use of iron and tamed the horse. These gave them superiority in warfare over the people of Mohenjodaro and made Aryan conquest of India possible.

The Aryans settled down in villages and began to develop the pattern of rural life which has remained basically unchanged to this day. Their social institutions, religious beliefs and forms of worship were influenced by what they found prevalent in India but they in turn influenced the life of the indigenous people. It is not certain if the Aryans brought the Vedas with them or composed the Vedic hymns after their arrival in India. In any case, for the vast majority of the Indian people, the Vedas became the repository of religious faith. In fact, belief in God and the Vedas and transmigration of the soul are almost the only articles of faith for a Hindu. The Aryan influence is also seen in the occupational division of society into four major castes and in the fourfold division of the life of the individual. The new Aryan society which developed in India between 1500 B.C. and 1000 B.C. is to this day the basis of the life of the Hindus who constitute the vast majority of the Indian people.

There are no regular histories of this early phase of Aryan settlement in India. A picture of the life of the people can, however, be obtained from the epics and other literature. Of the epics, the most important are the Ramayana and the Mahabharata. The story of the Ramayana refers to an earlier period when the Aryans had not yet achieved their dominion over the whole of India. In fact, some regard it as a record of the Aryan incursion into south India. There is

mention of cities built by Aryans, but it is clear that the most magnificent cities were built and inhabited by non-Aryan people. The majority of the Aryans had settled down to an agricultural life but there was still room for pioneering activity along the fringes of the Aryan settlement.

By the time of the Mahabharatā, practically the whole of India had come under Aryan sway. There were magnificent cities built by the Aryans but the majority of the people still lived in the villages. The pattern of life was not very different from what obtains to this day. Trade and commerce had increased but it is interesting to note that even at this stage, the Aryans depended on non-Aryan architects and engineers for some of their most ambitious projects.

Rama and Krishna dominate these two epics but their historical period has not yet been definitely fixed. In fact, it is not even certain whether Rama was an individual or the apotheosis of kingship. With regard to Krishna there are similar doubts. It is, however, interesting to note that both Rama and Krishna were conceived as dark in complexion. The Aryans were fair and in the earlier phases of their settlement in India, extremely proud of the fact. The contempt with which they referred to their dark-skinned enemies would bring joy to the most fanatic votary of white supremacy. How and why they accepted the dark-skinned Rama and Krishna as heroes and gods is not known. It may however be regarded as an act of supreme statesmanship which went a long way in winning over the native inhabitants of the land.

As life became more settled, social forms became

more rigid. The occupational division of earlier times slowly ossified into caste. There was for long a struggle for primacy between the Brahman or the priestly class and the Kshatriya or the warrior class. In course of time, the Brahman won and established his domination over the whole of society. The simpler naturalistic religion of the Vedas gradually gave place to Brahmanism with its emphasis on a priestly class and elaborate rituals of worship. Earlier Aryan polity was largely elective and the society democratic. In course of time, they gave place to states that were monarchic and societies that were hierarchical both in spirit and form.

With the age of the Buddha and Mahavira we come into historical times. Round about the sixth century B.C., there appears to have been a great intellectual and spiritual ferment throughout the whole of the then known world. Confucius in China and Zoroaster in Iran were near contemporaries of the Buddha. This was also the period which saw an outburst of spiritual fervour among the Jews of Palestine. Whatever be the reasons for this spiritual efflorescence it led to religious movements which have had far-reaching influence on the history of man. We are not concerned in this brief study with the influence of Confucius or Zoroaster. It is enough to point out that the impact of the Buddha has been one of the most significant in the history of man. His was perhaps the first attempt to solve the mystery of existence in rational terms and without recourse to mysticism. He emphasised good conduct and taught the eightfold way by which man can live at peace with his fellows. He broke away from ritualism and the rigours of caste which had become

characteristic of Indian society. His influence did not remain confined to India but in course of time spread throughout the world.

The first definite date which helps to fix Indian chronology was the invasion of Alexander in 326 B.C. Alexander did not penetrate far into India but as a result of his invasion, a great deal of information about India became available to the western world. He had brought with him a number of Greek philosophers, scientists and historians. Aristotle, it is said, wished to discuss with an Indian philosopher the Indian solution to problems of metaphysics. There is a legend that Alexander took away with him a number of Indian scholars to satisfy the wish of his teacher. It is certain that the earlier contacts between western Asia and India were further developed as a result of Alexander's invasion.

The first empire in Indian history was established almost immediately after Alexander's withdrawal. There are earlier references to empires which unified India but these are based on myth and legend and we have no historical record about them. Chandragupta Maurya was on the other hand a historical figure and organised a vast empire which stretched from Afghanistan to the borders of Bengal. He maintained a large and well-equipped army and introduced the system of government by commissions. Separate commissions and committees were in charge of clearly demarcated functions of administration. Special measures were taken for the development of agriculture, crafts and commerce. He received envoys from foreign kings and we have in the report of Megasthenes, the Greek, the first foreign account of Indian life and institutions.

It is held that many of the innovations in government were introduced by the Prime Minister, Chanakya, who has been identified with Kautilya, the author of the first Indian treatise on economics and politics.

Under Chandragupta's grandson, Asoka, almost the whole of India was brought under the sway of the Mauryan empire. Asoka has left edicts in different parts of India containing exhortations to his people. He is reported to have undertaken only one war, namely the conquest of Kalinga or modern Orissa. His empire is however believed to have been larger in size than that of his father or grandfather. There is no record of how this expansion of the empire took place. One explanation offered is that his empire was federal and many of the smaller border states acceded voluntarily to the federation.

Asoka's rule may be described as benevolent paternalism. He looked upon himself as the guardian not only of the wealth and material prosperity of his subjects but also of their moral and spiritual welfare. Asoka was a great champion of the Buddhist faith and did everything he could to expand the influence of Buddhism in India and outside. There was however no discrimination against men who followed other religions and in one of his famous edicts, Asoka declared that a truly religious man has regard for all faiths. It was due mainly to his patronage that Buddhism spread beyond the shores of India. There are records of missions sent by him to Ceylon, western Asia and Egypt and it has been suggested that his missions also visited Burma, China and Japan.

After Asoka's death, the Mauryan empire gradually

broke up. The reasons for the decay of the Mauryan power are not fully known. One explanation offered is that fresh invasions from the north-west took place at a time when India was militarily weak. This weakness, it is said, was due partly to the long period of peace enjoyed under the Mauryas and partly to the influence of Buddhism which discouraged martial activities. Whatever be the reason, it is believed that the first incursion of the Bactrians into the Punjab took place round about 200 B.C. It was not that there was no resistance from India. There is evidence that Pushyamitra pushed back one of the Bactro-Greek kings, but the repulse was temporary. This is proved by the existence of a number of Greek principalities in north-west India about this time. One of the most well-known of these Indo-Greek kings is Menander, popularly known in Buddhist mythology as Milinda.

The inter-regnum between the fall of the Mauryan empire in the second century B.C. and the rise of the Gupta empire in the fourth century A.D. was one of turmoil and unrest, at least so far as north India was concerned. With the weakening of the imperial power, new tribes were continually pouring in. After the Graeco-Bactrians followed in quick succession the Indo-Parthians, the Sakas and the Kushanas. There was a brief interlude of comparative peace and consolidation with the establishment of the empire of Kanishka in A.D. 78. He was a Buddhist, had his capital in Purushapura or modern Peshawar and ruled a vast empire from central Asia to the heart of India. It is interesting to note that a statue of Kanishka clad in what corresponds to the modern achkan and pyjama

is the first evidence we have of the introduction of this dress in India.

After the break-up of Kanishka's empire, there was again a period when small principalities were continually fighting one another. Some of these rulers were foreign in origin but were quickly absorbed in the Indian social hierarchy. The period of internecine war and disorder came to an end only with the establishment of the Gupta empire. Like earlier periods of imperial consolidation, this also was marked by a great cultural efflorescence which has led some people to describe the Gupta period as the golden age of Indian history. After the preceding unrest and uncertainty, the establishment of law and order under the Gupta's must have come as a great boon. Agriculture and commerce flourished and there was an era of peace and prosperity throughout the land. There were also great developments in almost all forms of art. Some of the finest Indian sculptures date back to this period. This was also one of the greatest periods of Sanskrit poetry. Samudra Gupta was not only a great conqueror but a great patron of music and scholarship. Chandra Gupta II, popularly known as Chandra Gupta Vikramaditya is held to be the most distinguished king of ancient times. Kalidasa, perhaps the greatest name in Sanskrit literature, is believed to have been his court-poet.

Buddhism had suffered a setback after the fall of the Mauryan empire. By the time of the Guptas, it was no longer the predominant religion of the land. The Guptas were patrons of Hinduism but they did not persecute the Buddhists. In fact, both kings and the common people did equal honour to the Buddhist

saints and monks and to the priests and gods of Hinduism. Life was simple but spacious. The state maintained law and order but the laws were mild and bore lightly on the people. We have an interesting account of the life of the times in the writings of Fahien, the first of a famous series of Chinese pilgrims who came to India as the homeland of Buddhism.

Like the earlier empires, the Gupta empire also broke down partly on account of internal weakness and partly because of attacks by trans-Indian tribes. India was again divided into a number of small principalities. It has been suggested that the break-up of the Gupta empire was due to the Huna invasion of India. Because there was no unified central power to oppose the invaders, they came in increasingly larger numbers. Because they appeared in larger numbers, the central authority was further weakened. There were temporary checks to these invasions but the invaders continued to pour in, in spite of the opposition of local rulers. Internecine struggles not only weakened them but also prevented a sustained and united stand against the foreign foes.

In early seventh century, King Harsha again succeeded in establishing a unified empire in north India. His efforts to extend his sway to the south were however checked by Pulakeshin. There were thus two powerful empires in the north and the south which offered peace and security to the people. With the establishment of law and order, the arts of peace again flourished. Agriculture and crafts and trades prospered. The restoration of peace was accompanied by general prosperity throughout India. Buddhism had lost its pre-eminence but it was still widely prevalent. Harsha

was a patron of both Buddhism and Brahmanism and welcomed to his court Hiuen Tsang, perhaps the greatest of the Chinese pilgrims to India. He has left an extremely interesting record of the court of Harsha as well as of the life of the Indian people.

Till recent times, there has been almost a set pattern in Indian history. There have been incursions of new tribes into India whenever the central power became weak. These tribes were almost invariably absorbed in the Indian social pattern. In fact, till the Parsees came to India in the eighth century A.D., none of the incoming tribes had been able to resist the pull of Hinduism. For one thing, many of these tribes did not have a developed culture of their own. For another, the occupational divisions of Indian society made it easy to fit them into an appropriate place in the social structure. From the ninth century onward, we find continual reference to a group of people called the Rajputs. They gradually replace the Kshatriyas as the ruling and fighting caste. The term *Rajputs* literally means the sons of kings. Their emphasis on royal origin and their insistence that they are the descendants of the epic heroes have often attracted comments. Many historians believe that most of them were in fact descendants of the tribes who came to India after the fall of the Gupta empire. Because they were newcomers, they were the more anxious to establish their ancient genealogy. Because they became the ruling caste only in recent times, they insisted the more strongly on their descent from ancient kings. However that be, from about the ninth century A.D. till almost the end of the Mughal period, the Rajputs played an

important role in the political history of northern India.

History is no science and does not permit any easy generalisation. Nevertheless, one may refer to two broad trends which characterise the whole of this early period. The first is the slow but steady Aryanisation of the land. Once the Aryans had subjugated and absorbed the earlier Indus Valley people, they spread throughout India and gave to all its people an unmistakable Aryan stamp. The second is a persistent attempt to achieve political unification of India. Starting with the mythical kings of the epics, we come across repeated efforts to establish empires which would coincide with India's farflung boundaries. The Mauryas and the Guptas all attempted the task and succeeded for brief periods. The material conditions for such unification had not however been achieved. This perhaps explains why their success was shortlived.

II

The historical outline becomes clearer and stronger during the medieval period but there is no material change in the pattern. Some eighty princes and princelings fought one another for supremacy soon after the death of Harsha and Pulakeshin. Throughout the medieval period, the same story continued. A majority of these chieftains belonged to different Rajput clans but a number of rulers were Muslims. Like Muslims outside India, they also had in their courts many chroniclers and devotees of history. They have left elaborate records of both political events and the condition of the people. In fact, Al Biruni's famous study is the first complete account of India obtainable

in any language. It is not only a treasure house of information on events and customs but also attempts an interpretation of Indian civilisation and culture. Al Biruni comments on the great diversity of faith and belief which he found prevalent in the country. They ranged from the pure monism of the Advaita to the crude worship of fetishes by the common people. Society was divided into castes. Neither socially nor politically was there a national feeling.

As in the case of the Aryans, the incursion of the Muslims into India was also spread over centuries. We often think of the Arab invasion of Sind in the beginning of the eighth century A.D. as the first appearance of the Muslims on the Indian stage. Sind became part of the Caliphate of Bagdad in 712 A.D. and like other areas under Arab occupation, was largely free from religious persecution or interference with the normal life of the people. The Caliph's dominion over Sind did not last very long but for about two centuries independent Muslim chiefs ruled the country.

Sind may have been the first Muslim principality in India but their first outposts in the country had been established almost a hundred years earlier in the far south. There was perhaps no sustained attempt at military conquest, but as early as 637 A.D., an attack was made on Thana (near Bombay). Other rich ports in western India had also attracted Arab notice, but in the main, they came as traders and stayed on to found colonies on the Malabar coast. In fact, it is generally accepted that the immediate purpose of the Arab invasion of Sind was to safeguard trade routes with south India and Ceylon. In course of time the Arabs

became a considerable force in these regions. Along with trade in goods, there was also commerce in ideas. It has been suggested that one of the reasons for the efflorescence of religious and philosophical activity in this southmost corner of India in the eighth and succeeding centuries was the impact of a new and alien force on the indigenous culture.

Except in these two centres of Arab influence, the large majority of Muslims who came to India in different times were Turks, Afghans of many varieties and Persians. Many of them were recent converts to Islam and had imbibed only some of the externals of Muslim culture. This did not prevent them from regarding themselves as the standard bearers of Islam. Many of the Hindu temples were great repositories of wealth. They were also at times strong forts and occupied positions of strategic importance. Their subjugation was often necessary for military reasons. At the same time, they yielded rich plunder to the victor. An attack on the temple was thus tempting to the invaders for various reasons.

Tribes from Afghanistan and beyond were attracted by the fabulous wealth of India. They no doubt used the name of religion to give a colour of respectability to what were essentially plundering raids, but the character of the raids belied their professions. There were lightning attacks on temples and forts followed by plunder of whatever could be carried away. Apart from sporadic raids, there were also occasional attempts to establish small principalities. The most famous of these early invaders, Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni, made many incursions into India, but his main purpose

seems to have been to acquire wealth and increase his power in his own territory. Neither the establishment of an Indian empire nor the propagation of Islam in India was his immediate objective and even the annexation of the Punjab was due more to military reasons than choice. The fact that there was no strong central power and the many small principalities were engaged in constant fights against one another made the task of these invaders comparatively easy. Nevertheless there were occasions of organized resistance, but superior generalship and better horses gave the invaders a decisive advantage in most trials of strength.

It was in the last decade of the twelfth century that a Muslim chieftain made the first serious attempt to establish a kingdom in India. The internal jealousies of a large number of petty princes lessened the strength of combined resistance, but even then the invaders did not have an easy entry. Shahabuddin was beaten back once but succeeded in defeating the king of Delhi in his second attempt. Like many other famous battles which decided the fate of India, this also was fought in the region round about Panipat, some sixty miles north-west of Delhi.

Kutbuddin, at first a slave but later the general and deputy of Shahabuddin established the first Sultanate of Delhi in 1206. He and his generals subjugated a large part of northern India but the writ of the Delhi Sultanate ran only so long as there was a strong man on the throne. Rule had to be autocratic if not frankly military. Communications were difficult and there was no strong administrative system. Constant change in rulers did not permit the growth of allegiance to any

particular dynasty and in most cases, the king's claim to loyalty depended on his military power. He was thus forced to rely on his generals, and in many cases, these generals owed only nominal allegiance to the king. Within his own orbit, each general or overlord ruled as a miniature prince. The system which developed may be regarded as an Indian form of the feudal system with the king as only the first among a number of equals.

A succession of rulers belonging to different dynasties followed. During the 320 years of the Delhi Sultanate, nine dynasties claimed dominion over India, but the claim was in some cases not even nominal. The chief aim of a succession of rulers was to establish military supremacy rather than political power. Even this differed from king to king. Large areas of south India were, except for brief periods, governed by independent rulers while outlying provinces like Bengal or Gujrat threw off the yoke of Delhi whenever they could. Though the Sultans of Delhi assumed the title of Shah-e-Alam or rulers of the world, a court wit once described them as Shah-e-Palam, or the ruler of the village Palam, now the airport of Delhi.

Alauddin Khilji, who was proclaimed Sultan in 1206 may be regarded as the first Muslim emperor of India. He ruled over almost the whole of northern India and penetrated far into the south. After many centuries, a central power had again emerged whose writ ran through a major part of India. There was also a notable change in the character of the administration. Alauddin aimed at the establishment of a strong central government and in the pursuit of this end, he often

ignored the advice and authority of the priestly hierarchy. He established a harsh system of administration which was intended to make the king supreme, for like Henry VII of England, his chief aim was the increase of the power of the king. As a means to this end, he severely restricted the opportunities of acquiring wealth and power by his subjects, whether Muslim or Hindu. In fact, his hand was at times heavier on the Muslims, for he felt that they were more likely to rise in revolt or otherwise cause him trouble. Though he did not abolish feudalism, he succeeded in severely curtailing the power of the nobles.

In 1500, as in 1200, India was divided among a number of small principalities. The only difference was that in the latter period, a number of the rulers were Muslims. Whether Muslim or Hindu, they fought one another with great gusto on the slightest provocation. It has been suggested earlier that it was the love of wealth and power, not the message of religion that brought the first Muslim invaders to India. In fact, these struggles of rulers had little relation with religion. Sultan Mahmud and other early invaders freely used Hindu soldiers to fight their Muslim rivals in and outside India. After the establishment of Muslim principalities in India, the religious colouring of these wars becomes still thinner. Of the six score or more battles fought in India between A. D. 711 and A. D. 1700, more than half were clashes where both parties were Muslims.

After the establishment of the Delhi Sultanate, Muslim generals who were sent out to conquer or rule outlying provinces declared their independence at the earliest opportunity. Since they could maintain them-

selves only with local support, they made common cause with the local people. The logic of events compelled a policy of religious neutrality, if not religious toleration. This was in evidence even in the earliest days. Kutbud-din, the first Sultan of Delhi, promulgated a decree that there should be no interference with Hindu religious festivals. With the passage of time and the establishment of new kingdoms, the forces of toleration gained in strength. There were occasional lapses and we read of incidents which shock our modern susceptibilities, but by and large, there was accommodation among men of different faiths. Maintenance of law and order was the main task of administration. So long as the king was benevolent and possessed military skill, his kingdom flourished.

In discussing Muslim rulers of India, we must remember that the Muslims came in succeeding waves. They were in most cases armies of fighting men who did not bring their women with them and took local wives. Again, in many cases the alternatives for Indian prisoners of war were permanent slavery or acceptance of Islam. These facts combined with active proselytisation led to the growth of a sizable Muslim population in the course of a few centuries. Hindu social customs were also responsible for the growth in the number of Muslims. Those who were low in the social scale found in Islam an opportunity to assert their dignity. The more sensitive among the socially privileged were often attracted by its democratic appeal. Besides, Hindu society looked askance at released prisoners of war and they often had no option but to join the Muslim fold. Such large-scale

absorption of Hindus slowly changed the character of Muslim society. Even those who had originally come from outside gradually came to look upon themselves as Indians. There were many instances where Muslims and Hindus of India combined to resist a Muslim invader from outside.

The real consolidation of Muslim power in India was achieved only after Babar won an empire at Panipat in 1526. Unlike some of the earlier conquerors, he had very definite ideas about the rights and duties of kingship. As a descendant of Timur and Chengiz, he claimed the whole of India as part of his heritage. He was however too good a general to attempt a conquest of more than he could hold. Even after he had decisively defeated Sangram Singh, he made no attempt to bring Rajputana under his rule. He was content to establish his dominion firmly over the Punjab and the region round Delhi. He did not live long enough to carry out the consolidation of the Empire but the principles of future Mughal policy were derived from his humane and tolerant attitude. In his advice to his son, Humayun, he clearly laid down that the King must treat all his subjects equally. He made an explicit reference to the religious beliefs of Hindus and asked Humayun to respect them.

There was an interlude of Pathan power when Sher Shah restored the Delhi Sultanate. He gathered under his banner a strong section of both Muslims and Hindus. In fact, his victory over the Mughals may be regarded as a victory of the Indians over the foreigners. It is perhaps not far-fetched to derive his concern for the welfare of the ordinary citizen from his sense of

Indian-ness. In any case, he introduced striking changes in almost every department of government. In the course of a brief but glorious rule he laid the foundations of modern Indian communication and revenue administration.

Akbar, the greatest of the Mughals, consolidated the work initiated by Sher Shah. He adopted and improved upon Sher Shah's revenue system. He abolished the system of farming out provinces to feudal or military lords and replaced it by an administrative service directly responsible to the central government. His greatest contribution was the abolition of distinctions based on religion and the offer of equal opportunity of service and advancement under the crown to all Indians. Toleration had been forced on many of his predecessors by force of circumstances. This applied particularly to the principalities that were established in outlying areas. Bengal and Gujrat had kings who were remarkably tolerant in their attitude to their non-Muslim subjects. This was equally true of the Bahmani Kingdom and other principalities in the south. Akbar's special distinction lies in his elevation of this practice to a principle of sovereignty.

Like some of the greatest Indian emperors of antiquity, he also was full of a spirit of respectful deference to all religions and had in his nature a strong mystic vein. He was, however, essentially a ruler and his was perhaps the first conscious attempt to formulate the conception of a Secular State. He also initiated a liberal social and religious policy which aimed at bringing about a fusion of the diverse elements which constitute the Indian people. In fact, he may in many

respects be regarded as the creator of modern India.

The Mughal dynasty would have been remarkable if it had produced only a Babar or an Akbar. In fact, it produced five or six generations of exceptionally able men. This partly explains the extent and duration of the Mughal empire and the hold it had on the imagination of the people. Another reason was Akbar's reorganisation of the administrative system. Though we cannot say that he established the rule of law, his reforms did to a large extent replace personal rule by governance according to rules. His policy was followed by his successors till the time of Aurangzeb who differed from Akbar in two important respects. While keeping the policy in his own control, Akbar had delegated large powers to his officers and ran his administration on a basis of trust. Aurangzeb could not trust even his own sons and tried to control not only policy but even the details of administration. Aurangzeb also differed radically from Akbar in his attitude towards his subjects. Akbar had treated all of them equally and offered every citizen an opportunity of serving the State. Aurangzeb could not treat even the Muslims on a basis of equality and reserved as far as possible his favours only for the Sunnis.

Aurangzeb's policy could not have served as the basis of a stable empire at any time. The experience of humane and tolerant rule under Akbar and his successors made Aurangzeb's policy even less acceptable. Before the end of his reign, he had alienated large numbers in almost every section of his subjects. The greatest opposition came from the Rajputs who since Akbar's time had been one of the major supporters of imperial

policy. Aurangzeb also alienated the sympathy of the Persian elements who till that time had supplied a large proportion of officers at various levels in the imperial system. Aurangzeb's own sons were out of sympathy with his policy. In spite of his great abilities and exceptional industry, the fate of the Mughal empire had been sealed even before his death in 1707. A new force had risen in the south in the Marathas who under the leadership of Shivaji presented a new and formidable challenge to Mughal power. Often defeated on the battlefield, the Marathas were never conquered and before Aurangzeb's death they had undermined the basis of Mughal power. x

We can thus notice two clearly marked phases in the development of Muslim power in India. The Sultanate began with a series of marauding raids but was consolidated into a kingdom, if not an empire in course of time. As with the Aryans in an earlier age, here also power spread slowly southwards and eastwards. There was little if any conscious interference with the life of the villagers. Because the invaders were few and concentrated mainly in strategic towns and cities, they did not in the earlier stages demand anything more than the payment of the taxes and revenues. After three hundred years of war and peace, the Muslims had spread throughout the sub-continent and their outposts were to be found in the farthest regions. As their number increased and more of the local people came into the Muslim fold, contacts between the Hindus and Muslims were established at many points. The character of the rule also changed imperceptibly but inexorably. The latter days of Delhi Sultanate had

started a process which reached its culmination in Akbar's time. With the establishment of the Mughal empire began an era, not only of consolidation but cultural synthesis and fusion. The processes initiated by Akbar set the pattern which persists in India to this day.

The establishment of the Delhi Sultanate also saw many interesting innovations and experiments in administration. The problem throughout was for a small minority to maintain dominion over a large majority. Alauddin Khilji's attempt to run a centralised administration which would regulate prices and assure the masses a minimum standard of life is an interesting precursor of modern experiments in that direction. Muhammad Tughlak sought to introduce leather currency and even if he failed, initiated a development which has worldwide application today.

More important than these administrative reforms was the impetus given to the development of the modern Indian languages. Even before the advent of the Muslims, a fairly large volume of popular literature had grown up in Prakrit and Pali. Most of the books in these languages may be traced to the influence of the Buddha and Mahavira who preached to the people and spoke in a language they could understand. The main current of literary work however continued to flow through Sanskrit. Whenever the Brahminical influence grew, the importance of Sanskrit increased. When the Muslims appeared in India, Buddhism was dying, if not dead. This powerful support of local languages was therefore no longer active. The patronage of a succession of kings and its championship by men like

Sankaracharya had restored the prestige of Sanskrit.

The position was completely transformed after the establishment of the Sultanate. The Muslims had no particular reason to favour Sanskrit. In fact, in the earlier stages there was latent hostility to it. On the one hand, they introduced Persian as the language of the court. On the other, they sought to establish closer contacts with their Hindu subjects, and for this the best medium was obviously the local language. Government patronage for languages like Bengali date back to the fourteenth century. Within two hundred years of the establishment of Muslim rule, the local languages had achieved a new dignity and a new life. A succession of religious teachers and saints also played a very important role in this development. Special mention may in this connection be made of Kabir and Nanak, Chaitanya, Tulsidas and Tukaram.

After Aurangzeb's death, India was again divided into a number of principalities, large and small. These kingdoms entered into alliances and fought one another without any definite principles. At one stage there seemed a strong probability that the Marathas would establish a unified empire in India. The administrative ability of the Marathas was not however equal to their military prowess. They appeared on the scene as the champion of Hinduism against the tyranny of Aurangzeb but after the death of Baji Rao in 1740, their attitude towards other Hindus changed. The Mughal empire failed because Aurangzeb converted friendly elements like the Rajputs and the non-Indian Muslims into enemies. Maratha power was never consolidated because, except for a very brief period

under Shivaji and his immediate successors, the Marathas were unable to retain the friendship and confidence of even the Rajputs or the Jats.

The social condition of the people remained largely unchanged throughout the Muslim period. The earlier Muslim rulers were mainly interested in retaining their military and political power. They did not interfere with the normal life of the people so long as their rule was not challenged. The collection of revenue and administration of justice remained largely local concerns. Even Akbar's reorganisation of revenue and political administration did not materially alter the situation. The villagers continued with their own way of life. All that happened was that in addition to the Hindus, there was now a community of Muslims. Normally they shared the life of their Hindu neighbours, but in moments of clash or conflict claimed special treatment in virtue of their affiliation with the rulers.

III

The first contact between India and modern Europe took place in 1498 when Vasco da Gama circled the African continent and landed at Calicut. The Portuguese established a small trading station and were at first mere traders, but from the very beginning they had imperial ambitions. Students of European history will remember that one reason why the Portuguese turned towards the East was the Pope's allotment of the western hemisphere to Spain. As soon as therefore they had gained a foothold, they sought to establish an empire in India.

The Portuguese evoked no hostility when they first

came, but their conduct led to clashes with the Indian people within a few years. It seemed likely that they would be pushed out when in 1508 some Indian rulers in alliance with the Arabs defeated the Portuguese fleet. The victory was not followed up and the very next year, they re-established their naval ascendancy. They, however, realised that they had little hope of establishing an empire by direct conquest and became more careful and circumspect. They used skilfully the technique of intervention in local disputes by siding with one local party or another and played upon the religious differences of Hindus and Muslims whenever they could. They also built up a powerful military machinery by drilling and training Indian troops under European officers. After a century of intrigue and struggle, they founded a kingdom on the west coast, but in spite of all their efforts, they could not establish an Indian empire. In fact, one may almost say that they could not hold any territory which was outside the range of their naval guns.

The Portuguese were followed by the Dutch, the British and the French who were all attracted by the fabulous wealth of the East. It is difficult to say if these later comers had any imperial ambitions initially. When they first came to India, the Mughal power was firmly established and they were content to get trade licences from the government. They thus began as traders but before long, they were tempted to share in the quest for empire. They had their trading stations on the outskirts of the empire, and at first fortified them for self-defence against robbers and other raiders. It was, however, almost inevitable that their strug-

gles in Europe should be reflected in their trading posts in India. In course of time, these fortifications became centres of both defence and offence against one another as well as against Indian rulers.

Of the European powers in India, the Portuguese faded out first. This was due to various causes. The gradual decay of their naval power led to a loss of their position in Europe. A second reason was the diversion of their interest to the west after the discovery of Brazil. Perhaps the decisive factor was their unpopularity due to religious intolerance which provoked strong hostility from the Indians. Of all the European powers who came to India, the Portuguese were the most zealous in propagating the Catholic faith. Not only did they carry out conversions on a mass scale but they also encouraged marriage with Indians as a means of spreading the faith. Soon, in addition to the Syrian Christians—an indigenous community who have lived peacefully in India for some 2000 years—there was a large number of Indian Catholics.

The Dutch were the next European power to fall back in the race for power. They ousted the Portuguese from the East Indies (present Indonesia) and became strong rivals of the British and the French for the Indian trade. In fact, for some decades they were its chief carriers, but gradually a division of spheres of influence was established by the Dutch confining themselves to the East Indies and the British to India. The French were the last to appear on the Indian scene, and for many years they met with only indifferent success. They were, however, the first, after the earlier abortive attempt of the Portuguese, to think of establishing

an empire in India. About the middle of the eighteenth century, political motives began to predominate over their desire for commercial gain. It is interesting to note that the technique they used was almost the same as had been tried earlier by the Portuguese. Intervention in local quarrels and the building up of an Indian army trained by European officers in accordance with Western methods were the two important elements in this technique. French intervention in local politics provoked the British and in the sequel led to the establishment of the British Empire in India.

When the Europeans first came to India, they were certainly inferior to the Indians in the arts of peace. In the science of war also, they were probably at first inferior, but nevertheless finally won in the struggle for power. There were many reasons for their ultimate triumph of which three major ones may be briefly indicated here. The first was the break-up of the Mughal empire and the failure of any other Indian group to establish a strong central government. It is doubtful if even then the British would have succeeded in establishing an empire if in 1761 a military stalemate had not been created by the Third Battle of Panipat. This battle weakened not only the Marathas but also the Muslims and gave the British a breathing space during which they could strengthen and consolidate their authority in the east and the south.

2. The second reason for the British triumph was the absence of Indian naval power. The Mughals built a great military force but did not realise the significance of sea power. Among Indians, the Marathas and Hyder Ali had some conception of the importance of

2 naval forces and sought to build up powerful navies. They could not succeed because the attempt was made too late and in the meantime, Europe had established a lead in technical superiority. Technical progress was in fact the third and decisive reason why the British were able to establish their empire in India. From the seventeenth century onward, Europe started on a career of triumphant scientific discoveries. In course of time, these led to a transformation of the technique of industrial production and the science of war. For centuries, the Arabs and the Turks had defeated the Europeans because of superior military and scientific knowledge. Even in sea power, the Europeans had for long been inferior, but it was no longer so. Asia as a whole had fallen back in the race for knowledge and power. When therefore the clash came, Indian powers were unable to stand up to the British.

After the death of Aurangzeb in 1707, there followed a period of about 150 years when India was the scene of internecine intrigues and conflict. The ruler of Delhi remained in name the emperor of India, but real power rested with the local chiefs. The pretence was however kept up and rival claimants for power sought to use the titular emperor to advance their own ends. The Marathas fought with one another and the rest of India. In the east, the south and the north there were interminable clashes between rivals for local thrones. This exhibition of weakness and disunity of Indians was perhaps responsible for reviving the idea of empire among the European powers. As already indicated, the French were the first to restore the Portuguese practice of taking sides in the internal struggle

of Indian princes. Such intervention proved profitable both in terms of gain and influence. The French example was soon followed by the British. Starting with their intervention in the struggle between rival claimants to the throne of Arcot, the British in the course of hardly two decades established their de facto rule over Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. The facade of local power was however retained. Throughout the whole of the eighteenth century and well into the nineteenth century, the British claimed to be only the dewans or collectors of revenue on behalf of the Mughal emperor. Under Cornwallis (1786-1793), if not already under Warren Hastings (1774-1785), they had however become the effective government over large tracts of the country.

The British success was not easily gained. They met their first serious reverse in the south. For a brief period it seemed likely that the rise of Mysore might check the growth of British power. Hyder Ali of Mysore and his son Tipu Sultan were both able and brave. If the father was the superior general, the son was perhaps the greater patriot and placed independence above everything else. They were, however, unable to combine with the Marathas or the Nizam and this, in spite of Tipu's clear perception that the threat to his freedom came not from any Indian power but the British. The rapid rise of Hyder Ali had excited the jealousy of the Marathas and the Nizam. The British played skilfully on these feelings to form an alliance with them against Mysore. After twenty years of warfare the power of Mysore was finally broken.

The next Indian power to be overcome by the British were the Marathas. Warren Hastings had fought

against them but it was only after the fall of Mysore that the British felt strong enough to challenge the Marathas seriously. Between 1800 and 1820, Maratha power was destroyed. There remained only the Sikhs in the Punjab but after the death of Ranjit Singh they had no leader with the necessary authority or genius. The first active intervention of the British in Indian politics took place about 1750. By 1850, they had become in name as well as in fact the paramount power in India.

We may recapitulate very briefly the stages of the extension of British power in India. After the Battle of Plassey (1757), they became the dominating power though not the rulers of Bengal. In 1765 they obtained from the Mughal emperor the revenue rights over Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. The fall of Mysore in 1799 gave them control over large territories in the South. Wellesley (1798-1805) who finally broke the power of Mysore also introduced the system of subsidiary alliances for bringing Indian princes under British influence without actual warfare. The territorial acquisitions were continued under Dalhousie (1848-1856) who utilised the doctrine of lapse to take over the administration of Indian States whenever there was failure of a natural, or the British did not approve of an adopted heir. Since it was the British who decided all disputes about succession, this meant that they could take over almost any area they wanted: The discontent created by this policy led to the outburst of 1857 and the supersession of the East India Company. The British Crown assumed direct responsibility for the administration and declared that there would be no further territorial

acquisition. In 1877 the British queen was formally proclaimed the Empress of India.

The history of the rise of British power in India was in several ways different from the establishment of the Mughal empire. It is true that Babar laid the foundations of the Mughal Empire in 1526 after the First Battle of Panipat, but within fifteen years, almost all traces of Mughal influence had been wiped out. The real beginning of the Mughal empire is therefore from 1556 when Akbar won the Second Battle of Panipat. Within 30 years of that date Mughal rule was firmly established over the whole of northern and part of southern India. By contrast, the British needed almost a hundred years to establish their rule from their first participation in local politics.

A second important difference is that while like all former Indian empires, the Mughal empire had also been based on land forces, British rule was due to superior sea power. In fact, this was the first occasion in Indian history when an empire was established by a seafaring nation. The Mughal empire had started in the north-western corner of India and gradually spread to east and south. British power began in the south-eastern coast but perhaps because of the constant threat of Hyder Ali, Madras could not become the spearhead of British advance. Bombay also lived under the shadow of the Marathas. Besides, Hyder Ali and the Marathas were, as already mentioned, almost the only Indian rulers who had a sense of the importance of sea power. In these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that very soon the centre of British power shifted to eastern India. It was from the seaport of Calcutta

that British power gradually extended throughout the country.

The most important difference between the British and all previous empires in India is however to be found in the character of the ruling authority. Earlier empires had been established by soldiers and adventurers, who had set out to establish kingdoms. The British came to India to trade, and even after they had achieved political power, it was a trading company which exercised authority over the land. The fact that it was a trading company had an important bearing on the character of the administration. A king even if he is alien in origin is compelled by the logic of events to have some care for the welfare of his subjects. A trading company is, on the other hand, frankly motivated by the desire to earn profits. So long as the East India Company was the ruling authority, it was therefore not suprising that the administration was geared to the commercial needs of its share-holders rather than the welfare of the human beings placed under its charge.

The purely commercial character of the administration did not, however, continue for long. Among the Company's servants even at the earliest stages there were men of great vision and ability. The British Parliament also started to interfere with the affairs of the Company at a fairly early date. Clive's administration was brought under parliamentary scrutiny and within ten years of the assumption of the *Dewani*, the Regulating Act (1773) was passed to check some of the Company's more undesirable activities. Pitt's India Act of 1784 placed further curbs on the Company and

its officers. The impeachment of Warren Hastings revealed grave defects in the administration and led to demands for greater parliamentary control. With the appointment of Cornwallis in 1786, an independent political and military figure was for the first time placed at the head of the Company's administration. Cornwallis accepted the post on the condition that he would have over-riding powers over his colleagues who were servants of the Company.

The increasing interest of the British Parliament thus led to a slow but steady change in the character of the East India Company. The Regulating Act provided that the Company would have to communicate to the British government all despatches *received from* India relating to revenue, civil and military affairs. The Charter Act of 1781 extended this provision to such despatches sent to India. Pitt's India Act of 1784 made the Company virtually a subordinate department of the Government. The Charter Act of 1813 did not make any large constitutional changes but abolished the monopoly of trade so long enjoyed by the Company. It also made an annual provision for the encouragement of education, literature and science. The Charter Act of 1833 divested the Company of its commercial character and for the first time threw open the prospect of higher appointment to Indians, even though this remained only a promise for many years. The last Charter Act was passed in 1853 and threw open the service of the Company to competition. The Company was thus deprived of even its patronage. By now, the Company had really ceased to be a commercial concern. Even the semblance of the Company's

rule disappeared when, after the Indian struggle of 1857, the Crown assumed direct responsibility for the Government of India.

This account of how the rule of a private company was gradually replaced by public administration responsible to the British Parliament is, however, only half the story. The other and more important half of the story is the gradual transfer of the responsibility of administration from the British to the Indian people. The Company was at the outset a frankly profiteering concern. Assumption of power by the British Parliament introduced an element of regard for public welfare. It is, however, obvious that this regard could not become fully effective till the administration became a Government of the people by the people and for the people of India.

The first attempt at introducing an element of responsiveness to Indian public opinion is marked by Metcalfe's Press Act of 1835. It abolished censorship and gave the Indian press an opportunity for free expression of opinion. Metcalfe was perhaps far in advance of his age and the statutory right could not always be freely exercised. Even this was withdrawn by the Vernacular Press Act of 1878 which discriminated between the English and the Indian press. The following year, however, saw a long step forward. Without Indians in responsible positions in the administration, even well-intentioned laws often remained dead letters. With the constitution of the Statutory Civil Service in 1879, the promise held out in the Charter Act of 1833 was for the first time given practical shape.

In the meantime, the association of the people with the Government developed by gradual stages. The

Indian Council Act of 1861 provided for the association of non-officials in the legislative activities of both the Central and the three Presidency governments. Though these non-official members had strictly limited powers and were all nominated, it gave them an opportunity of considering the activities of the Executive. In 1882, Ripon issued a Resolution for introducing local-self government on the lines of the English law and followed it by abolishing the Vernacular Press Act. He also initiated legislation for removing existing judicial discriminations but was forced to drop the Bill on account of vehement and concerted British opposition. It is perhaps not an accident that one year after Ripon left was held the first session of the Indian National Congress. The Indian Council Act of 1892 marks a further step. It introduced the representative, though not the elective, principle in both the Central and the Provincial legislatures. It also gave them the right of discussing the Budget and asking questions on matters of public interest.


The greatest change was, however, brought about by the introduction of the western system of education in India. This was not at first encouraged by the Government of the day but the zeal of a handful of Christian missionaries and some Indian leaders of vision and faith overcame all administrative inertia. The work of missionaries like Carey and Indian leaders like Raja Ram Mohan Roy received a great impetus as a result of Macaulay's vehement support for Western education. With the establishment of the three Universities of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay the supporters of Western education had definitely won. Indian minds now had

direct access to the scientific temper and the liberal political thought of the Western world. Whatever be our criticism of the defects of the existing system of education there is little doubt that it is responsible for the Indian renaissance.

The partition of Bengal in 1905 created a new political temper in the country. With the spread of education and rising political consciousness of the people, the demand for self-government became stronger. The Morley-Minto reforms of 1909 and the Montford reforms of 1919 proved inadequate. The break-up of old established empires in Europe and the gradual transformation of the British Empire to a Commonwealth—in which former dependencies like Canada or Australia achieved equality of status with Britain—inspired the Indians to greater efforts for freedom. The Round Table Conferences of 1930-32 deserve special mention in this connection. They were the first occasion when representatives of the Indian people met the representatives of the British Government on terms of equality in discussing the future of India. The Government of India Act, 1935, gave Provincial Autonomy and promised a large measure of control over the Central Government. The outbreak of the War did not permit the working of the Federal Scheme and in the meantime, the Indian nation had moved on to demand complete independence and severance of the British connection. In 1947, the Indian Independence Act recognised India's right to settle her own destiny. It is interesting to note that when India had achieved complete independence, she decided to become a Republic but did not consider it necessary to give up her links with the Commonwealth.

THE ARYAN SYNTHESIS

FROM immemorial times, India has been the meeting place of conflicting races and civilisations. From immemorial times, she has tried to achieve a unity for the heterogeneous elements which make up the totality of her life. Hers is perhaps the oldest civilisation with an uninterrupted history. Most of her contemporaries have ceased to exist. She has not only survived but maintained and developed a continuous culture. Different races have met and fought and fraternised on her soil. She has absorbed all of them into her blood. Conflicting cultures have struggled for supremacy here. She has ground and modelled them into her own likeness. Foreign races and foreign truths have alike been grist to her mill. Their struggles have ended in new syntheses that marked new levels of achievement for the human spirit. She has lived through recurrent centuries of war and pestilence. She has triumphed over natural calamities and human misrule. Whence this vitality that overcomes destruction and death? Whence this wisdom that reconciles opposing truths? The story of India's culture unravels the secret of that vitality and that wisdom. It is a story of unity and synthesis, of reconciliation and development, of a perfect fusion of old traditions and new values.



I. Unity in Diversity

TILL recently the Aryans were regarded as the earliest invaders of the land. It was thought that they came to a country which was uncivilised and barbarian, but modern research has pushed back the limits of Indian pre-history. There were invaders even before the Aryans poured into this land. They had evolved a civilisation higher than that of the Aryan hordes who came in their wake. These pre-Aryans had displaced still earlier peoples and built up a new civilisation which has astonished modern scholars by its extent and depth. The Aryan invasion repeated the process and led to fresh infusion of the old with the new. This continued with the successive inroads of fighting races who came to conquer but remained to lose themselves in the Indian racial cauldron. The Greek invaders were followed by Sakas and Huns and a hundred other nameless tribes. They all appeared on the scene as victors but were soon absorbed in the ranks of the vanquished.

Each fresh incursion of race or idea found the Indian temperament more malleable than before and accelerated the process of assimilation and synthesis. At its worst the process led to a mechanical juxtaposition. At its best it brought to birth a new and organic way of life. The seething cauldron never cooled, for new ingredients were continually added and in turn added to the richness and complexity of Indian life. Some acute student of

sociology may some day link the upheavals in Indian social forms and Indian modes of religion with the incursion of some fresh batch of invaders from outside but as yet the story remains incomplete and merely hypothetical. This much alone can be said. Today whatever is Indian, whether it be an idea, a word, a form of art, a political institution or a social custom is a blend of many different strains and elements.

In spite of this derivation from many sources and the consequent variety of forms and types, we find a remarkable unity of spirit informing Indian culture throughout the ages. In fact it is this underlying unity, which is one of the most remarkable features of Indian culture. In volume and duration no civilisation with the possible exception of the Chinese can bear comparison with the civilisation of India. The area of the land, the number of the people, the variety of the races and the length of history are hardly repeated elsewhere. The vitality of Indian culture is equally amazing. In spite of a thousand vicissitudes, it has survived to the modern day. It has not only survived, but displays an energy which promises to make it one of the most fruitful sources of the future culture of the world. This has been possible only on account of a sense of Indian-ness which imposed unity on all diversity and wove into one fabric of national life the many strands of different texture, colour and quality which have entered here.

Unity and uniformity serve as the basis of the continuity of the Indian tradition. The ancient world threw up fine flowers of civilisation in many lands.

With the exception of India and China they are all dead and gone. New civilisations may have blossomed in such ancient lands, but they are novel growths. It is only in India and to some extent in China that the old civilisation and culture have grown and changed, but never grown or changed at the expense of an underlying unity. This has been possible only through the capacity of re-adjustment exhibited by Indian society. Capacity of re-adjustment is the index of life, and the secret of the long and continuous life of Indian civilisation lies in the fact that Indian thought and Indian social polity have adjusted and re-adjusted themselves to the changing circumstances of different periods with an elasticity that has rarely been equalled.

One ground of this adjustment is found in the spirit of toleration that has characterised Indian history throughout the ages. 'Live and let live' has been the policy of the Indian in all spheres of life. Sometimes this has been carried so far that contrary if not contradictory attitudes have been allowed to survive simultaneously. Toleration has led to the sufferance of evil and even to indifference to the values of life. This, however, is at worst the defect of a virtue. Such toleration is perhaps preferable to the fanatic devotion which leads to the denial and persecution of all other values but its own.

Throughout the changes of Indian history, we therefore find a spirit of underlying unity which informs the diverse expressions of its life. But the unity was never a dead uniformity. A living unity never is. Universality carries with it the demand for variety and particularity. Whatever is universal cannot be

exhausted in any one particular form. This is so in the case of even abstract truth. The same truth reveals itself differently in different contexts. To deny this is to deny the possibility of communication. In the realm of empirical fact, the same event is experienced and expressed differently by different persons. In the case of concrete reality this is still more the case. Whatever seeks to be universal can have only a categorical form. The content must differ with different people in different ages and different climes. The unity of Indian culture has been based on a real universality. Differences and divergences have never been alien to it. On the contrary, it has dominated and unified all manifestations of outward difference.

Unity and universality must belong to any culture that is true and vital. In a sense, unity and universality must belong to culture as such. Culture is a concept which cannot be simply or unitarily defined. There is no single character or mark which can be regarded as the essence or differentia of culture. It is always a complex of many strands of varying importance and vitality. If we attempt to differentiate between culture and civilisation, we might say that civilisation is the organisation of life which makes civil society possible. Such civil society is the condition for corporate life in which alone individuals can pursue fruitful and creative activity. Culture on the other hand is the resultant of such organisation and expresses itself through language and art, through philosophy and religion, through social habits and customs and through political institutions and economic organisations. Not one of them is separately culture but collectively they

constitute the expression of life which we describe as culture. Civilisation is the organisation of society which creates the conditions of culture. There can, therefore, be no culture without civilisation, but there may be civilisations which have not yet developed their culture. Perhaps what is more often the case is that there are civilised peoples among whom only a small section have achieved culture. We have therefore had and still have races and nations that are civilised, but we have not yet had any nation or race that could be regarded as cultured in all its sections and classes. Culture is the efflorescence of civilisation.

It was inevitable that without control over the forces of nature, the extent of culture should be considerably less than that of civilisation. Man's limited power and resources compelled association, as without association man's survival would itself be in jeopardy. Association secured the conditions of survival, and once survival was guaranteed, released sufficient energies for the development of culture on a rudimentary scale. Culture was, therefore, the result of liberation from the urgency of the problem of existence while civilisation was the form of machinery evolved for the achievement of such liberty. It is, therefore, not surprising that culture should be less pervasive and widespread than the machinery of civilisation. What is surprising is that India should seem to offer an example where culture is almost as extensive as civilisation itself.

The experience of some Western countries gives us cases of civilisation without culture. In fact, one of the most serious problems of modern times is to create a culture for nations which have achieved

high success in evolving the organisation and instruments of civilisation. In India, on the other hand, the processes of civilisation have not been so highly developed as in Europe or America, but the stage of civilisation evolved has expressed itself in the pervasive character of culture which extends through the vast majority of her people. Even the casual tourist has observed that in India the difference between the masses and the classes is not one of quality and can be explained in terms of information and opportunity. It was otherwise in many countries of Europe till recently. There the difference in quality between the masses and the classes was at times so great that it often shook the faith in democracy of the most fervent of democrats. The developments in technocracy have not yet changed this state of affairs completely, but on the contrary tended, at least in the initial stages, to develop human morons. In India, even the backwardness in development and application of scientific techniques has not lowered the human quality nor reduced the innate skill and intelligence of the village artisan and craftsman.

This remarkable phenomenon can be explained only in terms of the unity and continuity of Indian culture. Unity, we have seen, is in one sense, the common characteristic of all culture. What specially distinguishes the culture of India is its unbroken continuity. Here, there have been no violent or sudden breaks but on the contrary a steady growth and expansion of culture which has gradually permeated every class and section of society. The length of her history is no doubt one of the most important of the contributing factors but

her long history would not have sufficed unless the spirit of toleration had made possible the unity and continuity of her traditions.

2. *Geographical Influences*

BOTH directly as well as indirectly, India's geography has been largely responsible for her spirit of toleration. Directly, the influence of geography has operated through the vastness of the land as well as its climate. The vastness of the land influenced the mind in two ways. The great variety in landscape, climate and conditions of life predisposed the mind to an acceptance of differences. Besides, the vast spaces offered room for slow infiltration by new-comers and allowed each locality unhampered scope of development along its own lines. On the whole, Indian climate makes for lassitude and passivity, especially when one compares the easier conditions of life to the rigours of the central Asiatic steppes from which most of the Indian invaders came. The tempo of change was thus slowed down. The very processes of history unfolded in leisured dignity. The geography of the country explains the peculiar features of Indian history, while the combined effects of geography and history show themselves in the realm of the spirit. Toleration and easy acceptance have therefore been characteristic of India. Clashes there have been on the material plane. On the plane of the spirit where culture flourishes, we find evidence only of synthesis.

Geography has been largely responsible for the sense of Indian-ness, for rarely has a country been so clearly

marked out to be a unity. India is shut off from the rest of Asia by the inaccessible barriers of the mighty Himalayas. Attendant mountain ranges extend like protecting arms right up to the seas. The ocean on all other sides makes her a compact territorial unit whose internal cohesion is matched by her sharp differentiation from all external lands. Not only are her territories thus sharply demarcated from the rest of the world, but nature has generously placed within her boundaries almost all the resources that man needs for developing a rich and creative life. Situated in one corner of Asia, she did not feel the full impact of the great movements of population that swept across the Eurasian continent. India combines difficulty of access from outside with vastness of the tracts available for habitation and culture within. Together, they made India ~~more immune from foreign attack or interference~~ than has been the case with most of the other countries whose civilisations flourished in ancient times. We often talk of the many invasions of India. Compared to the vicissitudes suffered by Iran, Mesopotamia, Syria or Egypt, she has enjoyed calm and tranquility, and developed her civilisation unhampered by interference from outside.

One might go so far as to say that Indian geography demanded the unity of her history. Physical features so sharply mark off India from the rest of Asia that attempts either to divide the country or to expand it beyond its natural frontiers have invariably failed. The Aryan invaders who came from outside soon lost their connections with the Aryans in the trans-Indian lands. Attempts of the Aryans to keep Afghanistan

within India also failed. Notwithstanding the survival of names like Kandahar, Afghanistan soon moved out of the orbit of Indian life. Greek attempts to incorporate the Punjab into Afghanistan failed equally with the Maurya attempt to retain Kandahar. The attempts of Mahmud Ghazni to rule India from Kabul failed while the Pathan emperors soon lost control over the trans-border lands. The Mughal empire exhibits a repetition of the same story. Similarly, Sind has often been annexed to, but could not be incorporated permanently in the territories of Persia.

This clear demarcation from the outside world is matched by an equally insistent movement for unity within India. From the earliest times, we find kingdoms and principalities seeking to impose one common rule over the whole country. The legendary stories of Ramayana and Mahabharata tell a story of unification. The first historic figure of whom we have any record is Chandragupta who sought to bring the whole country under one rule. Asoka continued the tradition and in fact brought more of India under one common rule than has been the case at any time before the establishment of the Indian Union. Monarchs who followed continued the tradition. During the empire of the Pathans and the Mughals, we find the same story repeated time after time. Sharp differentiation from the world outside and a unified government within have been the goal of Indian polity, from the days of pre-history to the modern day. The whole course of recorded history witnesses to the movement for unity which geography has imposed upon India.

The geographic unity of the country has had its

effects on the economic life of the people. One geography has resulted in one economy. Here also the size of the country and its fertility helped in unification. The size of the country and the quality of the land permitted slow extension of the people and gradual expansion of cultivation. Smaller size would have compelled expulsion, if not extermination of earlier settlers and much greater intensification in cultivation. Marked differences in quality of land would have forced uneven development in different areas. Either of the contingencies would have led to continuous experiments with the methods of production and the emergence of new types of economic society. There is little doubt that the forms of production and the relation of the different classes to the productive forces have a deep influence upon the forms of society. The fact that India has continually maintained and developed an agricultural economy for almost four or five thousand years explains in part the depth and tenacity of her culture and traditions. The very length of time has helped to create a common mentality. The tendency has been further strengthened by the unity of economic organisation throughout the land.

It is common experience that people of the same avocation develop a similar mentality. The fact that Indian economy has been primarily agricultural led to the development of common characteristics and a common outlook. Agricultural communities the world over are inclined to be tribal and parochial. The unit of life is the village community. Social co-operation is restricted to the members of the village group. Such conditions preclude on the one hand the development

of an individualistic outlook and on the other the growth of a social consciousness that transcends the limits of the family or the tribal unit. In India we have always found deep loyalty to the family or the clan, but evidence of equal loyalty to the nation or the country is rarely to be found. In fact the restriction of economic life to the village community prevented the growth of the consciousness of nationhood.

The predominantly agriculture bias of Indian economy has influenced national character in another way. The peasant, specially before the achievement of partial control over the forces of nature, was largely dependent for prosperity on factors over which he had no say. He could control neither drought nor excess of rain. Yet these were the phenomena which were determinant factors in his economic life. Is it surprising that the peasant should the world over exhibit an attitude of fatalism and fortitude before the buffets of fate? Commerce and industry on the other hand demand more of the individual but also tend to make him self-reliant, aggressive and adventurous. A society whose economy is primarily commercial or industrial gradually develops in its members greater resilience, vivacity and individual initiative.

Indian political vicissitudes have been largely conditioned by the inadequacy of her scientific equipment to her geography. While her geography demanded unification of the country into one State, the prevalent stage of control over the forces of nature rendered this difficult to achieve and almost impossible to maintain. There has therefore till recently been unity of culture without unity of administration. The position has how-

ever changed. With increasing scientific advancement and consequent condensation of space and time, conditions of political unity have also now been assured. A unified State with a unified culture backed by India's vast potential resources can well make India a leader of the world in many fields of human activity.

Even the darkest clouds have a silver lining. The political vicissitudes of India have also had redeeming features. An attitude of toleration has fostered simultaneous development of different strands. As we have already indicated, this forms one of the most significant characteristics of Indian culture. Political vicissitudes have contributed to the growth of the many-sidedness of life. The waves of foreign races and tribes who poured into India from the earliest times led to constant changes in the structure and distribution of political power. The break-up of the country into many principalities of differing importance was another immediate consequence. The existence of many kingdoms and the constant shift in their power made people less aggressive and intolerant. It also induced in the people an attitude of toleration and acceptance of the foreigner.

In spite of many invasions and dynastic changes, the life of the people flowed in one continuous process of gradual change. The civilisation of Mohenjodaro was not destroyed but taken up by the Aryans who built their culture on its basis. This continuity is so marked that there have been scholars who doubt whether Mohenjodaro represents a pre-Aryan culture at all. They believe that India was the original home of the Aryans and Mohenjodaro marks only an early stage in the development of Aryan culture. We need

not enter here into the question of racial affinity. It is undeniable that traces of Mohenjodaro have been found in successive stages of Indian life and culture. Siva and Sakti cults in modern Hinduism have been traced to the traditions of Mohenjodaro. Seals have been found there which supply the originals of the statues of the seated Buddha.

Political clashes brought into juxtaposition different tribes and in fact different stages of culture. The early Indians were thus forced to recognise that man's knowledge and understanding of reality is not static but dynamic. It does not stand constant but continually evolves. There is a bewildering variety of Indian religious forms. They exhibit almost every stage of spiritual development from the open fetishism of the masses to the rigid and uncompromising monotheism of the Vedantist. The incorporation of a multitude of different tribal creeds at all stages of development into the body of Hindu religious thought can alone explain this strange multiplicity.

Geography of the country demanded political unification. The stage of scientific knowledge did not permit the fulfilment of that tendency. We therefore have constant efforts at building of unitary empires. The material conditions explain why such empires did not continue long. The early empires and attempts at colonisation are today remembered but dimly. History has little record of them but legends and tradition linger in the memory of the race and even today work as a cementing factor. So great was the sense of unity that few foreigners could resist its force. Few people remember today that the Rajputs were in fact foreign

intruders who came fairly late. Their foreign origin is forgotten. Not only have they been incorporated into Hindu society but have sometimes been regarded as the special champions and depositories of ancient Indian culture. We shall discuss the advent of the Muslims more fully at a later stage but even they were absorbed in the stream of Indian life. It is only the Europeans who have resisted the tendency towards Indianisation and retained their separate identity intact. In consequence they have never been accepted by the land or the people, and in spite of many points of contact remain mere birds of passage.

3. *Socio-political Interactions*

WE HAVE already seen that the urge for unification in ancient India could not achieve political unity on a permanent basis. We have also seen that the urge for unity expressed itself in terms of civilisation and culture. One expression of this cultural unity is to be found in the political institutions which were then developed and persist to modern times. One fact has often attracted notice. In spite of the many changes in kings and kingdoms, the organised social life of the community has hardly changed in the last two or three thousand years. The village republics which were established in India in early times are in one sense extant to this day.

The communities described in the Vedas and the Upanishads were popular and democratic. The will of the people found expression in elected assemblies and democratically governed institutions. There are also references to elected kings and to the power of banishing kings or recalling banished kings. With the rise and consolidation of empires, the power of the popular assemblies was curtailed. The survival of Panchayats and their exercise of wide if undefined powers prove that the democratic tradition has never wholly died.

In the earliest period, each group of villages had its *samiti* or elected assembly. It conceded the right of free expression and open discussion to all its members

and decided not only political but social and religious questions as well. The Buddhist monasteries were also democratic orders. There is evidence to suggest that even the establishment of the Maurya empire did not destroy these republics. Asoka's empire was perhaps a loose federation rather than an empire in the commonly accepted sense of the word. This would also explain its magnitude. We have reasons to believe that under Bindusara the empire did not extend beyond what is modern Hyderabad. The only country Asoka forcibly conquered was Kalinga or Orissa. Asoka's empire however extended over almost the whole of India. This enlargement may be explained by the voluntary adhesion of the smaller republics south of Hyderabad to the loose federal empire of Asoka.

The village republic was the natural unit for an agricultural economy. The fact that India is to this day predominantly agricultural explains why in spite of the rise and fall of dynasties, she has kept her tradition of village autonomy almost intact. Agricultural communities can be self-contained and represent perhaps the only instances of *autarky* in actual operation. The village communities of India were therefore independent and have retained to this day a large degree of their independence. Village autonomy constitutes one of the continuing and stable features of the social life of India.

Though Indian economy has remained dominantly agricultural, it could not remain solely agricultural for long. Soon trade and commerce developed and led to a division of labour which finally ossified into the institution of caste. The growth of trade and

commerce brought with it a necessary expansion in the unit of economic life. The incorporation of village republics into kingdoms and empires was the political expression of this change. With the increase in the size of the political unit, the functions of government became more and more complex. This led to increasing centralisation in the interest of uniformity and better administration. The distinction between local and central government increased. Many of the powers and duties of administration passed out of the control of the village communes. Nevertheless, agriculture remained the dominant industry of the country and to this day the tradition of village self-rule has persisted. To this day the village Panchayat is not only the local executive and judiciary but also exercises considerable legislative powers with or without the sanction of the State. In fact, the Panchayats exercise control over the social and religious life of the community in a way which the State can never emulate. This holds not only in southern India with its predominantly Hindu population but also in northern India and in areas where the Muslims predominate.

The continuity in the economic and political life of the Indian village community has had its effect on social habits as well. Here the results have been on the whole undesirable. Rigidity of the economic forms has not only prevented the growth of wealth but also made for a rigidity of temper which resists reform and innovation. It is not surprising that peasant communities the world over have been characterised by a conservative and narrow outlook. Trade and commerce not only make for quick turnover of material

goods, they also lead to circulation of ideas and a readiness for accepting novelty and change. In India, the agricultural economy and village communes have combined to make the average villager conservative and inert. They have also tended to break the sense of national solidarity and weaken the capacity for united political action. We find in India the strange paradox that in spite of a strong consciousness of cultural unity, the people have suffered from a deficiency in the instinct of unified national political action.

The strength and the weakness of Indian culture in its social aspects can be best studied in the institution of caste. The criticisms against caste are obvious. It has broken up the unity of Indian life. It has prevented the growth of democracy. Among the higher castes, it has engendered snobbishness and pride. Among the lower castes, it has induced a spirit of inferiority and servility. Among all sections of the people, it has hindered the development of a common humanity. In spite of these and other valid criticisms against caste, it must nevertheless be conceded that the institution owed its origin to a spirit of toleration and accommodation.

To regard the institution of caste as an expression of toleration might at first sight seem paradoxical. The paradox disappears when we remember that India has been the arena where races appeared as conquerors and were in turn conquered by a succeeding invader. In such a context of heterogeneity of blood, colour and language, of diverse customs and beliefs, the achievement of a single social and political entity seemed almost impossible. The European colonisers in the 18th and 19th centuries were faced with similar

problems in America, Australia and Africa. The contrast between the European and the indigenous population was great, but it was no greater than that which faced the Aryan invaders of India. In fact the problem of adjustment was more complex in India. The Europeans faced local tribes as a fairly homogeneous group. These tribes also represented a more or less homogeneous stage of development. In India, the tribes and races which faced one another were not only many, but they represented the widest possible variety in the level of civilisation and culture. The European colonisers had to resolve the clash of duality. The Aryan settlers were confronted with the resolution of multiplicity into a working unity.

The Europeans solved the problem of racial diversity by almost exterminating the native populations in America and Australia or enslaving them in Africa. The Aryan settlers found the answer in the institution of caste. Judged by the standard of abstract justice, there is no defence for a system which condemns to perpetual inferiority millions of human beings for no crime other than the accident of their birth. From the standpoint of actual history, there are however points in favour of a system which at any rate permitted the weaker sections to survive. It may thus be said in partial defence of caste that it sought to integrate many different races into one social whole and find room for different stages of civilisation within one cultural unity.

In origin and intention, if not in actual operation, the institution of caste was therefore a device for enabling different races and individuals to live together in harmony. This device worked only through its elasticity

which reconciled men to the institution. Originally, caste was based on function and not heredity. Individuals as well as families could pass from caste to caste. The fact that along with the inclusion of Dravidian gods in the Aryan pantheon, Dravidian priests were accepted as Brahmins is evidence of the fluidity of the system. This possibility of movement from caste to caste developed a sense of solidarity and helped to minimise the enmity between the Aryan and the Dravidian. Caste also helped to mitigate the economic conflicts which are at the root of most of the ills of modern Europe. The predominantly agricultural economy of the country was one reason why such class conflicts never came to a head in ancient India. The absence of control over the forces of nature was another. But perhaps the chief cause is to be found in the original flexibility of the institution of caste. Men are often content to suffer present evil for the hope of future gain and the institution of caste held out such hopes both here and hereafter. With the disappearance of its elasticity, the institution of caste lost whatever justification it once possessed.

The unity and continuity of Indian culture is also manifested in her various languages. The differences of her languages are often exaggerated today, and exaggerated for obvious political reasons. No exaggeration can however ignore their fundamental unity of temper and outlook. It cannot be denied that they are derived from different sources, tribal, Dravidian and Aryan. Like the synthesis of caste, a synthesis of language has preserved many of them and allowed each of them freedom of development within one common outlook. Sanskrit, as the name itself suggests, is a language

constructed out of some earlier form, but it has deeply influenced all other languages of India in vocabulary and structure.

This influence has gone so deep that scholars have at times been led to regard all Indian languages as variations from one common Sanskritic base. Even a language like Tamil, with a literature which was fairly developed before the advent of the Aryans on the Indian scene, has not escaped this influence. The Sanskritic tradition has not faded with the passage of time. New languages which came in the wake of new invaders challenged its supremacy, but Sanskrit has held and perhaps deepened its influence. All Indian languages thus have a large common vocabulary and exhibit marked similarities in grammatical structure. Even more remarkable is the unity of temperament expressed in all of them. The earliest Tamil poetry is full of the hatred of the Dravidian for the Aryan invader. The early literature of the Aryans expresses their fear and hatred of the Dravidian and other pre-Aryans. The mood of conflict and hatred does not however persist for long. The spirit of accommodation which united the different races into one social system also expressed itself in the literatures of India and softened the antagonism of races and tribes.

4. *The Kathak*

THE ARYAN conquest of north-eastern and southern India was primarily cultural, not physical. The fusion between the races soon became so complete that the Dravidians forgot that they could claim a civilisation much older than that of the new invaders. On the side of the Aryans, the hatred and distrust for the culture of the Dravidians changed into a spirit of acceptance and assimilation. In the new composite culture, both the warring groups could find a meeting point as well as a symbol of unity. We no doubt find in the Ramayana and the Mahabharata suggestions and memories of the earlier conflict between the Dravidian and the Aryan but even in this conflict there is recognition that each of the parties had virtues which the other could accept to its own advantage. The Mahabharata even more than the Ramayana helped in this process of synthesis which was continued in the folklore of the Buddhist and other movements of reform.

It was the wandering minstrels belonging to different sects who were primarily responsible for giving the unity of outlook and temper which, in spite of local differences, characterises to this day the mentality of the Indian peasant from one corner of the country to the other. People have often wondered at the philosophic temper and fortitude of Indian village folk. Sometimes it is hardly distinguishable from passivity

and submissiveness. Low vitality often makes for fatalism and calm submission to fate, but there is probably a limit to people's power of self-deception and philosophising. The demands of life in India are few and they are easily satisfied, but even in the days when the Indian peasant did not suffer from lack of food, he was content to speculate upon the mysteries of fate. Climate may have something to do with it, but even when we have made allowances for all these factors, the rustic here has in some sense a philosophy of life, and can talk of fate and circumstances with a detachment and insight that surprises the unaccustomed foreigner. This quality of resignation and tolerance in his mental make-up is all the more surprising in view of the almost universal lack of literacy in India today. Whence comes this culture of the mind when even the culture of letters is denied to him?

This paradox resolves itself when one remembers the role of the village story-teller and the wandering teacher and mendicant who went about the countryside. It was their function to bring through simple stories the teachings of religion and morality within the reach of the average villager. Such tales compensated to a large extent for the peoples' lack of a literary education. Philosophy was translated into myth and religion embodied in the actions of man. Morality came easily and naturally in the form of legends. Virtue was taught through parables in which each generation added to the wisdom it had inherited from its predecessors. Village life was thus enriched by the incorporation of the wisdom of generations.

The story-teller's art is almost a forgotten art in

India today. We no longer meet the wandering minstrels who recounted tales of ancient valour and romance, and sang their way all over the land. The village kathak or story-teller has also disappeared and left behind him a void that is difficult to fill. For the minstrels and story-tellers performed a most valuable function in the social economy of the village. They were the custodians of local tradition and faith. They kept the memory of deeds of heroism and sacrifice fresh in the people's mind. They were the reporters of notable happenings and gave to passing events the currency of legendary eternity.

The story-teller was not only a historian and a poet, he was in himself the one-man precursor of the Indian theatre or *Yatra*. The modern stage and cinema were unknown. Even to this day they are a luxury beyond the dreams of the vast majority of villages. Most little towns possess a cinema of sorts, and village folk, in spite of trade depression and the slump in prices, flock to see the apotheosis of luxury and futility upon the silver screen. Even religious passions are excited and satisfied in the modern cinema, but in the past it was all different. Before the days of the rude, makeshift *Yatra*, the story-teller was the sole comfort and solace of the villagers. His art supplied to their imagination the pageants which remained unseen. His vivid words painted before their eyes visions of heroism and sacrifice, of conflict and disharmony, and the final consummation in which truth and virtue triumphed.

We are yet far from exhausting the functions which the story-teller performed, for it would be a mistake to think of him as a mere individual. He was an in-

stitution without which village life would lose its interest and point. Actively, he was many things in one, but he served also as the focus in which the social life of the village was concentrated and came to consciousness. Men gathered to hear his tales, but once they had gathered, they naturally talked, and talked about the things which interested them. The story-teller's *soirée* was therefore a social clearing house, where not only were ideas exchanged and issues discussed, but rude justice meted out to social delinquents. The club was unknown and unheard of, but the want was hardly felt so long as people could gather in the evenings and listen to the story-teller's tales.

The story-teller rarely, if ever, moved away from the level of village life. Even in the wildest flights of his imagination, he had to remember his audience, for their appreciation and comprehension was the condition of his success and livelihood. His tales of heroism and sacrifice lifted the hearts of the villagers, but they never soared beyond their familiar world of everyday. Homely allusions and local references were freely absorbed in his currency and gave to his recitals the semblance of reality.

We are too often inclined to think of religion in India in terms of asceticism and penance, of a lyric ecstasy of the mind in which the familiar landmarks of everyday experience are swept away. It is all this and yet this is not all. For we tend to forget the simple pieties of day to day, of the normal routine of devotions which are as much a part of daily life as the physiological functionings of the body. The story-teller of old never made this mistake and his stories were woven round

the religious experience and expectations of the people. His tales of heroism centred round the mythical figures of traditional faiths, and their records of service and sacrifice were used to point a moral or illustrate a homily.

5. *Religion and Philosophy*

THE INDIAN religions tell the same story of unity and continuity. We have briefly referred to the fact that the bewildering variety of Indian religions is due to the incorporation of different and perhaps rival creeds into Hindu religious thought. The earlier Aryans worshipped the forces of nature and personified them in their myths and hymns. Soon after their settlement in India we find the Vedic gods steadily displaced. Their role is taken by a trinity in whose composition the place of Brahma is gradually taken by Sakti or female energy. The Vedic literature contains no reference whatever to any female deity to which Sakti might even approximate, while the references to Vishnu and Siva are also of the slightest.

Siva with a trident has been traced back to Mohenjodaro while the phallic element in his worship is also regarded as evidence of his non-Aryan origin. Scholars are generally of opinion that some pre-Aryan conception of Siva was superimposed upon that of the Vedic Rudra to determine the nature and worship of Siva in modern Hinduism. It has also been suggested that the story of the feast of Daksha from which Siva was excluded contains an allegorical reference to the late recognition of Siva. The conception of Vishnu as the dark god is also obviously non-Aryan. It can perhaps be explained best in terms of the attempt of the conquering

Aryans to win over the conquered peoples of the country by accommodating one of their principal gods in the Hindu pantheon. Sakti similarly has been regarded as the goddess of vegetation and was originally worshipped in spring. It was only gradually that she was accorded a place of honour in the scheme of Hindu gods.

The interesting point is that the Aryans in accepting the gods and goddesses of the Dravidians and other pre-Aryans modified both their forms and the ritual of their worship. This alteration did not however provoke any opposition and was accepted by all sections of the people. Such incorporation of the deities of rival races or nations into one pantheon is not confined to India. What is peculiar to India is the scale and degree of such incorporation. One reason for this was the attitude of toleration engendered by India's geography and history. This led to the recognition that though reality is one and unified, its manifestations must be different to different persons in different stages of civilisation. Quite early in their history, the Aryans therefore held that every creed contains elements of truth, for it is the product of man's insight at different levels into the same truth about the same reality.

The unity of the religious outlook in India has thus been based upon a philosophic spirit which recognises the value of both form and spirit, of outward ritual and inner essence. The earliest Aryan religious experiences recorded in the Vedas pay little attention to form or ritual. Man's deepest yearnings were satisfied by a spiritual communion with the forces of nature regarded as manifestations of the Supreme Reality. It is generally held that though there was no caste system among the

Aryan tribes at the time of their immigration, a priesthood had soon been formed. By the time the Rigveda was composed, the priestly caste had already separated itself from the rest of the tribe. This necessarily led to the growth of ritual and the development of elaborate forms of worship and sacrifice. In time, the material aspects of ritual increased so much that people tended to forget the inner purpose of religion.

The fourfold division of the Vedas shows traces of this process of increasing elaboration. Religion degenerated as a result of the division of labour which unfortunately ossified into caste. Worship became for all practical purposes the sole concern of a particular class which regarded it as a profession or means of livelihood. The need for religion can, however, no more than the need for food, be vicariously satisfied. Empty rituals and forms of worship provoke discontent in sensitive minds. We find that a series of reform movements began which culminated in the teachings of the Buddha. As the materialistic ritualism had taken an extreme form, the reaction was also extreme. The Buddha preached the total renunciation of ritualism and worship and laid his whole emphasis on morality and spiritual discipline.

The intensely intellectual approach of Buddhism was often beyond the range of the average man. Soon a new form of ritual grew up within Buddhism itself. This ritualism proved even more materialistic than the ritualism which the Buddha had sought to banish. The Buddhist metaphysics of transience was misunderstood by many who argued that since all things are momentary, our acts and their

results also must be momentary. Such an attitude undermines the basis of morality and encourages a tendency to regard the world as illusory. This explains the looseness in morals which soon pervaded Indian society. It also explains in part the ascetic and negative attitude of mind whose growth led to many of India's political vicissitudes. Other-worldliness and passivism is often regarded today as the characteristic Indian attitude towards reality. It must be remembered that this is a fairly late growth. The story of ancient India is one of material prosperity and grandeur. The spirit of adventure which led to the building up of magnificent empires and the setting up of prosperous colonies across the seas is hard to reconcile with an ascetic and merely negative frame of mind.

There is other evidence as well of the recognition of both form and spirit, of outward ritual and inner essence in Indian religious experience and history. The conception of life as divided into four stages or ashramas is in one sense peculiarly Indian. It makes an attempt to combine materiality with spirituality, worldly success with spiritual excellence. Every man must go through the fourfold stages of initiation, householder's life, retirement and freedom from earthly bonds. No aspect of human desire or function is overlooked here. The excellence which is sought must be realised through individual as well as social activities. This is seen even in the conception of the values which every individual must seek. Man fulfils himself not by seeking the spirit alone, but by a realisation of the values of earthly and spiritual good. *Kama*, *artha*, *dharma*, and *moksha* are the goods which Indian thought postulates.

This fourfold classification is itself evidence that the economic and political as well as the hedonistic elements of human character are equally recognised. A broad-based acceptance of all the demands of life gave Indian religious outlook its tremendous vitality. It is this vitality which has enabled it to withstand the shock of time and change and the challenge of new ways of thought.

Fundamentally, therefore, it is philosophy which has determined Indian culture in all its various manifestations. The wide variety of the country, not only in her geography but also in her tribes and languages, customs and beliefs, political organisations and stages of culture, prepared the mind to an acceptance of difference and the search for unity in the midst of diversity. It was the peculiar glory of the Aryan invaders who came to this land that they could formulate a philosophical expression for this acceptance. The result has been that in spite of the most baffling differences in form, there is a unity, a continuity and strangest of all a unanimity in Indian thought which astonishes not only foreign observers but Indian students as well.

Indian philosophy has never been confined to the intellect alone, but taken up in its orbit the search for a new way of life. Indian philosophy is therefore essentially practical. Though this may have circumscribed the limits of its speculative adventure, it has helped in the integration of Indian life into a unity which recognises all differences as so many manifestations of the one reality. Neither solely worldly nor exclusively other-worldly, it helped both to justify and encourage a synthetic attitude of the mind. The world was conceived as a unity of reality manifesting itself in many different

appearances. Religion was seen as a unity of truth expressing itself in many different creeds. Both truth and reality are therefore understood as manifestations of the all-pervasive principle of unity in difference. This tolerant, synthetic and pervasive spirit of ancient Indian thought gave to its culture the resilience, toleration and flexibility which has enabled it to permeate the entire mass of the people and resist all attempts to break the continuity and life of the ancient tradition.

The unity of outlook which expressed itself in political institutions and economic organisations, in social habits and ways of life, in language and literature, art and architecture and religion and philosophy, still survives. Indian culture is thus from its earliest days the result of conflict and synthesis and the assimilation of elements from different sources into one common whole. How complete this process of integration was is proved by the fact that the foundation and frame-work of culture laid down by this early synthesis has never changed. It has no doubt grown and taken up within its orbit novel ingredients from novel sources. In spite of modifications which must result from such incorporation, all development has been along the lines laid down in the ages of the epics or perhaps still earlier. All other contemporary civilisations have disappeared and their culture is a theme for legend and history. The scientific and mechanical basis of Indian civilisation has also undergone radical change, but the outlines of Indian culture are still preserved. There can be no greater evidence of the resilience and vitality of Indian culture than the fact that its unity and continuity have never been sundered.

MEDIEVAL RECONCILIATION

THE STORY of Indian culture is one of continuity, synthesis and enrichment. We have already seen how the early periods saw the reconciliation of many opposite strands. The same process of conflict and synthesis, but intensified a thousand times occurred with the advent of Islam in India. For the first time in recorded history, Indian religious and social systems were faced with a system which was equally well-formulated and definite. The clash between them was accentuated by the contrast between their outlooks. Hinduism had in it an ascetic and other-worldly phase. In its concentration upon the Absolute, it relegated the affairs of the world to a position of insignificance. This was the aspect which Islam found dominant when it appeared on the Indian scene. Islam on the other hand was non-ascetic and centred upon this world in a conception of life which was vital, organic and social. The younger faith challenged the assumptions of the old and shook its social structure to the very foundation.

Out of the conflict and contrast between the two outlooks arose problems which it was the task of Indian culture to resolve. At first sight the present struggle between Hindus and Muslims suggests that the solution has not been complete. When we consider the volume of the population and the many points at which their lives impinge, what is surprising is not that perfect fusion has not yet been achieved but that

there should have been the degree of synthesis which has actually been realised. Besides, we also find that wherever there are points of conflict, these centre round material things. The history of India in the middle ages, as indeed of all races at all times, is a story of struggle for political power and economic supremacy. We can hardly find any trace of religious or communal conflict. The Mussalman no doubt fought the Hindu in medieval India. The fight was scarcely ever, if at all, fought over religious or communal issues. Conflicts between Muslims and Hindus were just as frequent or infrequent as those between Muslims and Muslims or Hindus and Hindus. Religious questions rarely entered into the minds of the rival protagonists.

The Arab invasion of Sind was inspired by commercial considerations. Mahmud of Ghazni's raids were more often than not directed to the exploitation of Indian wealth for the establishment and consolidation of his Turko-Persian empire. When the Afghans began to pour down into India, it was because of pressure from Central Asia which dislocated the population on the Indian borders. Aryans had come to India for identical reasons and had been followed by innumerable hordes of invaders throughout the earlier period. The Afghan and the Turk invasions are repetitions of the old story. Babar in his autobiography reveals in an unmistakable manner the operation of this principle in his personal life. It was the repetition of the old story but with one difference. The invaders who had poured into India after the Aryan incursions were, till the Arabs appeared on the scene, without any developed culture of their own and were swallowed up in the Indian stream. The new movement of peoples brought in men who had

adopted the externals if not the spirit of Islamic civilisation. The problem revealed itself as one of fusion of two distinct cultures and not the absorption of one into the other.

1. *The Hindusthani Way*

THE IMPACT of Islam on India was deep and profound. The contact between new and old modes of thought compelled acute and sensitive minds to think afresh about the eternal problems of the universe. Men's minds were freed from the tyranny of old traditional ways. New religions and philosophies were evolved to mark the rapprochement between Hindu and Islamic modes of thought. Yet the assimilation and synthesis between the two systems was not complete, for the facts of physical distance and inaccessibility remained. The interchange of thought and culture between the capital and the country remained imperfect. The cities displayed the fusion of the two cultures in which the numerical inferiority of the Muslim was counterbalanced by his political importance. The small, compact and on the whole homogeneous Muslim aristocracy gave the tone to civic culture. In the country it was otherwise. Difficulties of communication preserved some of the independence of the local units. Without constant interchange of men and ideas, the inherent rigidity of social forms was able to assert itself. The result was that Muslims in the provinces were influenced by the pressure of Hindu forms of life. Rural culture, in spite of large-scale changes in religion, remained dominantly Hindu, for men changed their creed but not their way of life.

In the extant textbooks of Indian history, the record

of difference and conflict is kept alive, but the story of fusion and synthesis is either forgotten or ignored. We are told the story of the rise and fall of dynasties, of invasions by new hordes from outside and gruesome accounts of oppression, pillage and rapine. There is hardly any mention of the growth of social or cultural institutions or the emergence of new social forms. Most Hindus believe that whatever manifestations of civilisation there were in India took shape in ancient days and hence Indian civilisation means in effect Hindu civilisation. Mussalmans on their part suffer from misgivings and doubt, for if there is no record of human progress during the many centuries they have lived in India, Indian culture must necessarily be Hindu and alien to them. It is because the co-operative effort of Hindus and Muslims in the creation of Indian culture has not been properly estimated that Muslim and Hindu look at one another with suspicion, hatred and contempt. The sense of frustration at the tremendous human wastage of more than eight hundred years is at the root of much of the communal bitterness of today.

Theoretical considerations alone are sufficient to reject such an interpretation of medieval Indian history. Even though we do not know all the facts, we can assert that it is incredible that two rich cultures should come into contact and remain unfruitful of new synthesis. Such historical sterility would be something unprecedented in the annals of man. Hindu culture was remarkable for both volume and extent. Even if it had lost some of its primal energy by the time the Muslims appeared on the scene, it retained elements of permanent value for the human mind. It was inevitable that Muslims

who came into contact with it should imbibe its spirit. Co-operation between the two would be directly proportionate to the intensity of their spiritual energy. In ancient India the higher civilisation of the pre-Aryans suffered military defeat at the hands of the invading Aryan hordes, but in time transformed Aryan mentality itself by enriching the cultural life of the conquerors. In Greece, Mycenaean civilisation was defeated on the battlefields but survived in the efflorescence of a higher Hellenic culture. The same story was repeated in the cultural conquest of Rome by Greece after Rome had conquered Greece politically. In India too in the conflict on the plane of power politics, the Muslims won but on the plane of intellectual and spiritual endeavour, the victory was mutual and can be more properly described as intimate and far-reaching co-operation.

The real history of India in the middle ages is thus the record of attempts at synthesis and co-operation between Hindus and Muslims on a thousand planes. The names of Ramananda and Kabir, of Nanak and Chaitanya and Moinuddin come readily to the mind. The growth of Vaishnavism in Bengal and of the Bhakti cult in Maharashtra may be directly attributed to this fusion of religious cultures. It was not on the spiritual plane alone that there were attempts at co-operative activity. At first under the Pathans and later on a wider scale under the Mughals, this is unmistakable in the evolution of customs and conduct, fashions and festivals, in the very preparation of food and in social and household affairs. In the matter of dress, a new costume was evolved which marks a breakaway from Arab or Central Asian influence. This period also saw

the growth of a new language which serves to this day as a medium of communication between Indians of different races and regions. The rich literatures in many of the Indian languages serve as reminders of the growth of culture in medieval India. In every sphere of social, political and cultural life we find the same impulse of fusion and synthesis. In architecture and sculpture, music and painting, in social habits and popular beliefs, the fusion of the old and the new created new forms in which the contribution of the two are inextricably mixed. In a word the mentality of the Muslim and the Hindu was so fused in the various manifestations of Indian genius that anybody who prides today in the unadulterated purity of his Hindu culture or his Muslim heritage shows a lamentable lack of historical knowledge and insight. Even as early as the time of Babar the process of assimilation had gone so far that he could characterise it as a unique mode of life—a mode to which he gave the name of the Hindusthani way.

The worlds of philosophy and economics are at the first sight almost totally unrelated. Yet in both these spheres we find unmistakable traces of co-operation between the Muslim and the Hindu. It is indeed difficult to say how much of the present world outlook of the Indian Hindu is derived from the Vedas and the Upanishads and how much from the teachings of Islam. In exactly a similar manner, in belief and in behaviour, in habits and in social institutions, the Indian Muslim shows unmistakable traces of the influence of Hindu culture and outlook. The influence of India was not in fact confined to Indian Muslims alone but affected the development of Muslim theology in Persia and Arabia as well. Buddhist modes

of thought had penetrated as far west as Egypt. There are scholars who find anticipations of the Sermon on the Mount in the earlier writings and edicts of Buddhism. The Essenes have at times been regarded as a Buddhist sect who settled down in Asia Minor. The basis of Sufism is to be sought in the Koran, but it has been profoundly influenced by the currents of Indian thought. Christianity and neo-Platonism, Zoroastrianism and Manism contributed to its development but perhaps the single largest external influence was the impact of Hinduism and of Buddhist philosophy. How else can one explain its attempt to submerge the individual in the Absolute in direct opposition to the traditions of Semitic religions since the time of Moses?

Reciprocity is the law in the sphere of mental influence. Profoundly affected by the modes of Indian thought, Sufism had in its turn a far-reaching influence on the Hindu religious outlook. Few suspect any external influence on the Vedanta of Sankara and yet there are reasons to suppose that he was influenced by the impact of Islam on the prevalent modes of thought. Since the beginning of recorded history, all new movements in Hindu thought, all innovations in Indian religion and philosophy had their origin in northern India. Suddenly about the beginning of the eighth century, there is a revolutionary change. The leadership of Indian thought and life is transferred to the south. Sankara and Ramanuja, Nimbadiya and Vallabhacharyya are all men of southern India. It is in the south that Vaishnavism and Saivaism rise and flourish. Political and social changes in the north cannot alone explain the sudden transformation and historians have been puzzled by

the sudden shift in the centre of national activities. We may find a clue to the solution of the mystery if we connect it with the advent of Islam in the south about the middle of the seventh century.

The first advent of Islam on Indian soil was in the south. Years before the conquest of Sind by Muhammad bin Kasim, Arab traders came into contact with the people of Travancore. This peaceful penetration went so far that if tradition is to be believed, the last of the Cheraman Perumal kings of Malabar was converted to Islam and left his kingdom on a pilgrimage to Mecca. The title of Zamorin of Calicut bears testimony to the authenticity of this tradition. Even to this day, a Mopla must be chosen to anoint him king. According to another fairly widely held tradition, Kaladi where Sankara was born belonged to a small principality whose king had also accepted Islam. There is no evidence that these conversions were the result of military conquest. Nor is there any indication that the change of faith by the king resulted in any large-scale conversions among the people at large. The evidence is by no means conclusive but the existence of such traditions indicates the extent and depth of the influence of Muslim thought on contemporary life in southern India.

The contact and conflict of the two modes of thought quickened new questionings in the individual mind. It was inevitable that an intellect so acute and vigorous as Sankara's should be attracted by this alien mode of thought and absorb out of it elements that suited his own cast of mind. The old religious faith and world outlook of northern India was synthetic, decorous and contemplative. The mentality revealed in the

new south Indian philosophy of life was aggressive and intense in its emotional abundance as well as its emphasis upon activity. The passivist, self-centred and predominantly intellectual mentality of the north was suddenly transformed into a revolutionary urgency in which even the intellect became an instrument of passion. Perhaps each single item in Sankara's philosophy, though with differences in emphasis, may be derived from old Upanishadic sources but the temper and shape of the synthesis achieved suggest the operation of some novel element. Is it fanciful to find in Sankara's fervour and zeal traces of the influence of the revolutionary zeal of Islam?

Sankara is from many point of view one of the most interesting figures in the history of Indian culture. It has been the practice to regard him as a product of purely Indian modes of thought. In fact it is even said that he was the champion of orthodox Brahmanical traditions against the liberal but heterogeneous teachings of Buddhism. It is also held that he carried the doctrine of unreality of the universe to its logical extreme with the result that no room was left for morality and righteousness. Sankara's absolute monism does at first sight seem to reject the world as mere illusion but if the world were mere illusion, all earthly activities would lose their significance. The Buddhists would then be justified in regarding all life as a bondage from which man must strive to escape by the suppression of desire. Even those who regard Sankara as the prophet of *mayabad* however agree that he was a vehement opponent of the Buddhist doctrine of Nirvana and the passivism which resulted from it.

Sankara's chief importance in the history of Indian thought lies in the fact that he sought to meet and answer Buddhist metaphysics on its own ground. With the Buddhists, he also denied the transcendental reality of the world and pointed out the self-contradictions which arise from a consistent materialism. From the contradictory character of ordinary experience, the Buddhists inferred that experience was unreal. Sankara pointed out that the inference was not justified for it was itself based on experience. He substituted in place of the concept of unreality that of inexpressibility or mystery. To condemn experience as unreal leaves unexplained why there should at all be experience. To describe it as illusory demands an analysis of the nature of the illusory. Even what we regard as illusions are thus in the ultimate analysis *anirvachaniya* or a mystery.

Sankara thus recognised the value of the contribution made by the Buddha in the realm of pure metaphysics. He also saw that the pure nihilism of the Buddhist philosophy destroyed the very basis of morality for the ordinary man. He therefore accepted the Buddhist contention that the inner reality is the Idea. Unlike Buddhists, he held that this Idea is a permanent everlasting unity, the real substratum underlying and supplying the basis of existence of everything in the world. As manifestations or forms of this Idea function through Maya, everything is relatively real, continues to be real and has to be accepted as real. It is only when, through attainment of supreme knowledge, men actually realise that Brahman is the one and only reality that they can transcend this empirical point of view.

Along with his acceptance of the Buddhist metaphysics,

Sankara accepted Vedic ritual and theology. He also emphasised the importance of such ritual for common men. He unequivocally recognised and accepted the usefulness of such acts as worship and meditation. It was through the devotional aspects of his activity and the recognition that meditation without a concrete object could not satisfy the ordinary man that he made the most important contribution towards the upliftment of the country and the permeation of a common philosophy throughout the masses.

The third element in Sankara's philosophy and teaching is the emphasis on action which he not only preached but also practised. The idea that Sankara discarded all action has become ingrained in our minds. We do not realise that this, if true, would make him a follower of the Buddhist metaphysics which he so vehemently attacked. He declared again and again that various acts prescribed in the scriptures must not be discarded and are essential in the earlier stages. This emphasis on action may be in the nature of a reaction from the denial of activity in both depraved Hinduism and depraved Buddhism prevalent at the time of his birth. It may also have been an element derived from the teachings of the Gita. Another, and some scholars have suggested, a more plausible ground for the emphasis on action may be found in the fact that Islam had already made itself felt as a force in the country of Sankara's birth. The fact that the emphasis on action is combined with a passionate insistence upon the unity of the Brahman reveals a source of affinity with Islam which is as strange as it is interesting.

Sankara's life and teaching is a shining example of

the spirit of synthesis which is a peculiar characteristic of Indian culture. His teachings combined the best elements in Hinduism and Buddhism. He evolved a practical philosophy which reconciled the two major religious systems of the land and set at rest the internecine warfare between the Buddhist and the Hindu. There are reasons to think that he also incorporated into his synthesis those elements of the teaching of Islam which were most suited to the genius of the land. His extreme monism, his repudiation of all semblance of duality, his attempt to establish this monism on the authority of revealed scriptures, his tendency to regard his own activity as mere restoration of the original purity of the revealed truth are all elements which remind one strongly of the tenets of Islam. When one connects this similarity in outlook with the appearance of Islam as a living force in his birthplace just before his birth, the inference that he was influenced by the new faith cannot be rejected summarily.

Sankara thus laid the foundation of the attempts at synthesis which constitute the religious history of India during the middle ages. Ramananda and Kabir, Nanak and Dadu, Chaitanya and Tukaram all carried on the same tradition. The most significant characteristic of these attempts at synthesis lies in the fact that there is no break or wrench from the past. The novel elements are skilfully and almost imperceptibly fused with the old and maintain the unity and continuity of the Indian spiritual outlook and endeavour.

2. *Economics and Art*

IN THE field of economic organisation, medieval India exhibits the same story of conflict and synthesis. The old agricultural economy was yielding place to a new feudalism based upon the fact of conquest. Within the rigid structure of this system, Alauddin's attempt to regulate the price of the necessities of life indicates a social consciousness transcending, however imperfectly, the limitations of individual interest. Muhammad Tughlak's attempt to introduce a token currency was premature and failed, but his various measures suggest that he perhaps had a dim awareness of the character of money as a mere medium of exchange without any intrinsic value of its own.

The interplay of political and economic factors has not escaped the attention of careful students. The close relation of capitalism and the Nation-state has often been noticed and yet such interactions are forgotten or ignored in the case of Indian history. We find hardly any recognition of the ways in which the measures of Akbar, perhaps without any realisation on his part, prepared the ground for the advent of capitalism. He introduced payment in currency in place of payment in kind in most state transactions, and in other ways encouraged the substitution of barter by a money economy. The reorganisation of land tenure started by Sher Shah was also concluded by him. All these

point towards the future supercession of feudalism by capitalist modes of production, but the process was not completed as its first condition, viz., the conquest and utilisation of the forces of nature, was still unrealised.

The origin of the struggle between individuals and groups in medieval India, as perhaps in other ages and elsewhere, is thus to be found in secular causes. That this was the case can be established by considering one remarkable phenomenon in the history of the times. The correlation between social and geographical conditions in Central Asia and the invasions of India has often been indicated. A phenomenon which has not yet received the attention it deserves is the emergence and duration of the Rajput power in medieval India. Speaking generally, one might say that before the eighth century and after the age of Aurangzeb, the Rajputs have hardly any importance in Indian history. But during these thousand years or so, they dominate Indian history and this in spite of their numerical and political inferiority to many other Indian groups and principalities. Before the eighth century, the centre of power in Indian politics shifted along the banks of the Ganges. From Asoka right up to the days of Harshavardhana, it was from the east that political leadership came. From the eighth century onward we find a remarkable change. The centre of power shifts from the east and hovers round the central point of Delhi for about a thousand years. This was also the period of Rajput glory and rise to power.

The explanation of this phenomenon seems to lie in the shifting of the commercial orientation of India. Till the eighth century, Indian trade routes pointed

mainly towards the east. Towards the east lay the Indian colonies and overseas settlements. Contact with countries so far off as China and Japan was continuous and extensive. There are no doubt references to trade with Europe as well but this could hardly compare with India's eastern trade. The result was that Indian political life leaned towards the east to derive its sustenance from the wealth which poured into the country from regions beyond the seas. After the seventh century, the situation changed. With the rise of Arab power, a new maritime trade developed between India and the west. We have already referred to Arab contacts with southern India from the seventh century and the Arab invasions of Sind in the eighth century mainly on account of commercial reasons. Gujrat became one of the centres of this trade and wealth began to pour into India from the west.

This reorientation of Indian commerce synchronises with the rise of Rajputs to importance. What gives greater piquancy to the suggestion of a relation between the two is the fact that Rajputana lies directly on the trade route from Delhi to Gujrat. The control of this route soon became the key to domination over the whole of northern India. We find that the story starts with the struggle between Rajput chieftains to achieve supremacy over this region. Soon the struggle between Rajput chiefs gives place to the conflict between Mewar and Delhi. From the time of Alauddin right down to the days of Akbar, the course of Indian history centres round this struggle. The battle-cry used in this struggle was often religious or communal, but the core of the conflict undoubtedly lay in the desire to

control this important trade route and thus dominate the economic life of the country.

The sudden fading of Rajput power out of the picture is equally significant. Aurangzeb's campaigns against Raj Singh offer hardly any explanation, for the conflict in this case was even more indecisive than the earlier struggles between Delhi and Mewar. Alauddin and Babar had inflicted much severer defeats and yet Rajput power could not be crushed by them. Akbar combined military pressure with friendly overtures to tame them and harness their energy to the expansion and maintenance of his empire, but even he could not stamp out their power or resilience. The real explanation of the decay of Rajput power must, therefore, be sought in a different field.

It is plausible to hold that the collapse of Rajput power, like its rise, is to be attributed to a new shift in the centres of Indian trade and commerce. As Arab commerce with India became more important than Indian commerce with the East Indies and Malaya, Gujrat became the trade-mart of India and Rajputana rose to military prominence. With the discovery of the route round the Cape of Good Hope and establishment of trade centres in Calicut and the east coast of India, the importance of Gujrat declined. With it declined the importance of the Rajputs in Indian history. The rise of Maratha power synchronises with this new development. The establishment of Portuguese, Dutch and other European trade connections with India made the control of the Indian Ocean one of the most important factors in the economic life of India.

With the growth of European trade interests, the

economic life of the country flowed into new channels. The centres of political life shifted to Madras and Calcutta. Soon Rajputs and Marathas were both reduced to political unimportance. The Marathas continued the struggle for a century, but after the replacement of the Portuguese and the Dutch by the French and the British as the main carriers of Indo-European trade, they also gradually lost in importance. The emergence of the port of Bombay, however, assured that they would not fade away from the picture. The history of the wars of the Rajputs and the Marathas against Delhi has often been held up as a case of the struggle between Hindus and Muslims on religious and communal grounds. The above analysis suggests that such history is, on the contrary, better explained on the hypothesis that conflicts generate on the plane of material interest and the introduction of religious or cultural elements is fortuitous and accidental.

The urge to unity and continuity is exhibited also in the development of Indian art in all its forms. Indian culture, we have seen, was built on the principle of unity in diversity. In religion, it led to an abstraction from all outward phenomenon and the realisation in mystic ecstasy of the identity of the self with God. When this vision of the inner unity is gained, there is a return to the world. The manifoldness of phenomena is then seen as the significant manifestations of a fundamental unity. Architecture was the objectification of this consciousness in solid mass. Outside, the temple luxuriates in form. Not an inch of empty space is to be found anywhere. The unbounded opulence of detail and ornament serves to manifest the real which is the

transcendental totality of all forms. The shrine inside is on the other hand a small dark cell with scarcely one ray of light. There the soul of man must stand alone, face to face with the eternal mystery.

Instances of a purely Hindu style are to be found mainly in the south. This does not imply that there is any single style which can be characterised as southern. It only implies that in spite of differences and variations, the southern structures show a basic identity in conception and execution. This is equally true of the structures of the north and differentiates them from similar architectural experiments in other countries of the world. The palaces, forts and tombs of northern India during the middle ages show traces of Persian influence. In spite of their similarity to Persian models, they reveal features that are alien to the ideals of Persian architecture. Though influenced deeply by Persian tendencies, they have their basis in the traditions of ancient India and are unmistakably Indian.

In the temples of the south, it is the straight line which dominates. All elaboration is based upon the composition of lines and angles. Another striking feature of this temple architecture is the exuberance of its sculptural decoration. Each pillar is carved out of solid rock and embellished with a hundred forms. The variety is so great that there is hardly the repetition of a single theme. In the famous temple at Canjeevaram there are about a thousand pillars. Not one pillar is a replica of any other. Even in the smaller temple at Simhachalam, the pillars are all of different forms and motifs. The aim of this architecture seems to be

to overwhelm our minds through an abundance of form and splendour.

The contrast with the architecture of the north is so glaring that it does not escape even the merest amateur. Even the temples in the north have broken away from the domination of the straight line. They exhibit a composition of the arch and the circle which subtly transforms the atmosphere. It is true that domes are rare, but even the turrets are different from those of the south. Those familiar only with the north cannot fully realise this. To them the difference between the temple and the mosque seems more prominent than their underlying similarity. But to those who have seen only the temples of the south, all architecture of the north seems imbued with a subtle aroma of the mosque. This is not surprising, for all the finest structures of the north—whether mosque or temple—are informed by a spirit of harmony and fusion of the two styles.

Economy of sculpture and other decoration in the north is not a mere accident. The emphasis is on symmetry of lines and balancing of masses. Volumes have been so disposed as to create an impression of uniformity. Architecture in the north centres round a basic idea. Its merit lies in harmony of structural achievement rather than the splendour and variety of the constituent units. It is remarkable that this synthesis could be achieved even in the case of temple architecture. Though foreign influences may be adopted in other spheres, the tendency is to resist its application to the religious field. The fact that Hindu architectural genius could even in the religious field adapt Muslim ideals to its own purposes is evidence of its strength and vitality.

The influence was not and in fact could not be one-sided. While Saracenic styles influenced old Indian traditions, they in their turn profoundly affected the character of Muslim architecture in India. One need not refer to specific instances of Hindu patterns incorporated in the Muslim architecture of the period. The lotus and the pitcher supply a constant motif in the constructions of the Hindu period, but we find its skilful use in the tombs of Muslim kings as well. One of the main characteristics of early Muslim architecture is its simplicity and severity. Line meets line with an austere grace in which there is hardly any room for superfluous decoration. Even where there are embellishments, these take the form of geometrical patterns or calligraphy raised to a fine art. In the architecture of northern India, this general principle of Muslim art undergoes an almost revolutionary change. Hindu and Muslim elements coalesce to form a new type of architecture. The severity of Muslim architecture is mellowed down and the plastic exuberance of Hindu art curtailed. The Saracenic emphasis on harmony and form is blended with the Indian emphasis on splendour and decoration. Where the fusion is complete, we have miracles of architecture like the Taj Mahal. Often the two systems have not been perfectly fused and we find domination of the one or the other style. Architectural curiosities like Fatehpur Sikri or the Itmaddoula remain as unfulfilled experiments in synthesis.

A nation is immortalized in its art. The political landscape may change from day to day and the shifting scenes leave no permanent impression on the world's mind. Even in philosophy the details often crowd

out the outline of the whole till the soul is lost in the intricacies of the intellect. In art, however, it is only the simple and the elemental that remain and stamp themselves upon the racial consciousness. That is why a nation's art reveals its inmost character and fixes it for succeeding ages and generations.

Of all the arts, painting is perhaps the most elemental and permanent. Words are counters in man's social intercourse. With change in social forms they also change. Music is elemental, but it is hardly permanent. The feelings it evokes are so fleeting and formless that its appeal seldom goes beyond a vague stirring of the soul. Its lack of definiteness disqualifies it for the full expression of the peculiar racial genius of a people.

Painting reaches back to the fundamentals and yet expresses particular racial or temporal physiognomy. The meticulous precision of old Persian painting is as significant of race as the elemental economy of Chinese art. The solidarity of Dutch bourgeois civilisation confronts the tortured soul of modern Europe in the painting of the two periods more truthfully and effectively than perhaps in any other form of art. And what is true of painting elsewhere is equally true of painting in India.

We need not linger over the long and forgotten history of Indian painting in the early ages. A hostile climate and the ravages of time destroyed what succeeding tides of invaders had left. Forgotten in the caves of Ajanta are precious achievements which preserve the memory of an attempt to paint in timelessness. An amazing plasticity of form conceals the movement away from the solid and the tangible. The Indian

summer irradiates heat and light, but the very radiance dissolves the individuality of objects into a blurred harmony of vague outline. These frescoes are the aesthetic expression of a culture which grew out of the synthesis of the experience of many races and imply a balance between opposing tendencies.

The walls and ceilings at Ajanta are covered with scenes drawn equally from the life of the crowd and the life of the devotee. The first type of pictures is inundated by the joy of life and represents power and glory, love and youth. The second group depicts the unexciting and tranquil life of meditation and represents detachment and devotion, piety and faith. But the two worlds are treated neither separately nor differently. They exhibit the same consciousness of the intense pressure and throng of life which we have noticed in the pre-Islamic architecture of India. The figures crowd upon one another. Men, women and children in all postures and attitudes are put together in bewildering confusion. It seems as if the painter was oppressed with the illimitable fecundity of life and sought to grasp and render it by the exuberance of his art. In all this variety, the sense of the unity of the real is never lost. The sanctity of all phenomena is expressed through the wonderful intimacy which the artist establishes between his human and his non-human figures. What makes the achievement at Ajanta even more amazing is that the medium through which the intensity of this thronging and unified life is rendered is primarily the line. It is a visual representation of the intuition of the unity underlying all phenomena.

The change to the sharp precision of Mughal and

Rajput painting is almost dialectical. Nevertheless the change is neither arbitrary nor abrupt. The art which was brought to India by Babar and his descendants was inspired by an intense individuality. It was not interested in crowds or masses and had hardly any direct interest in composition. It saw things in clear light and in definite outline. It looked at every detail of the individual figure and took infinite pains with it. Born and cradled in the courts of Chengiz and Timur, it could not conceivably be soft or sentimental. It felt the urge of life with tremendous force and communicated its passionate energy to what it painted. The stamp of individualism in such painting reached exaggerated lengths. Painting became mere portraiture, but portraiture of amazing cleverness.

When this vigorous and individualistic style of painting met the traditional painting of India, a new style was evolved which combined elements of both. Upon the plasticity of Ajanta were imposed new lines of symmetry, proportion and spacing. Devoid of the intense aspiration of ancient Indian painting, this world of courtly manners shows an innate lyricism always mindful of decorum. The abstraction of ancient Indian art arises out of the stretching of feelings almost beyond human capacity. In Mughal and Rajput painting the abstractness is the result of simplification and control. The one is ecstatic, the other static, but even its static-ness is informed by the memory of former ecstasy.

The classical music of south India reminds one at every stage of the temples of the south. The solidity of structure and profusion of details stamp them with

an unmistakable identity. The music of the north offers a sharp contrast. The solidity is replaced by an airy grace. Wealth of details gives place to spacing and harmony. Two different and contrary tendencies rule all art. One aims at decoration, prolixity and splendour. The other is dominated by the ideal of simplicity, economy and sobriety. The one seeks to overwhelm us by the profusion of form and the excess of its material wealth. The other attempts to influence us through economy of material and the restraint of its modes of expression. The former carries æsthetic experiment to its ultimate limits and seeks to express everything. The latter leaves the greater portion unexpressed and conveys its message by the barest hints and suggestions. The former expresses itself through the wealth of its achievement, the latter through the creation of a background where imagination finds free play.

These two modes express two complementary ideals of life. We find perfection in art where the rival streams of romantic and classical tendency are held in exquisite balance. We find a new excellence in life where the mentalities represented by these ideals are fused to create a new philosophy and culture. The Indian and Saracenic styles supplied complementary elements whose fusion created not only a great art but a deep abiding culture.

3. *Modes of Outlook*

WE HAVE suggested that the contact and fusion of Hindu and Muslim cultures in the south was responsible for the birth of a new philosophy. It is not surprising that the impact should be first felt in the sphere of the intellect. First acquaintance attracts the intellect more than the heart. Truths accepted by the intellect do not immediately influence behaviour. The time-lag between intellectual acceptance and emotional assimilation has often been noticed. But once a truth sinks into the consciousness, it begins to mould our emotions and gives rise to new experiments in art. Because this requires closer and longer contacts, we find that Indo-Saracenic art flourished mainly in the north.

We have pointed to the synthesis of Hindu and Muslim models in the achievements of Indian architecture. The Vaishnava songs and lyrics of Bengal offer another instance of such assimilation and synthesis. The elements for the emergence of a successful art were present in Bengal from early times. The advent of Islam acted as a catalytic agent which fused the elements together and brought Vaishnava poetry to its birth.

The Vaishnava poetry of Bengal is a miracle of synthesis, for it fuses an active mentality with a passive philosophy of illusion. The spirituality which is often regarded as a distinguishing feature of Hindu mentality

has in it an element of passivity and quiescence. One cannot but believe that in the early contacts between Muslim and Hindu, the first reaction of the Hindu was one of revolt. When the revolt failed, it led to a defeatism which expressed itself as indifference to the world. This ascetic reaction sought to glorify the spirit by minimising the importance of material success. In this attempt, it made people forget the glorious achievements of the early Hindus on the worldly plane.

There are few records today of the magnificence and splendour of the Indian imperial tradition. The story of Indian expansion and colonial conquests are today mere legends. The manifold activities of the human mind which characterized the life of ancient India were reduced to a dull ascetic grey by the time of the middle ages. Nor is this surprising. A mentality of asceticism is a necessary corollary to foreign conquest and domination. Even a society which is so essentially anti-ascetic as the Muslim developed an ascetic attitude after the British conquest of India. Hopes of reward and glory in an after-life were evoked to crowd out the consciousness of bitter defeats in the present. Dreams of transcendental excellence sought to cover up the agony of empirical disasters of every day.

This spirit of asceticism had served a useful social purpose in the economy of pre-Muslim culture in India. The emphasis upon the Absolute made men indifferent to inequalities in the material world. It reconciled to their fate those whom society had condemned to a hardly human life. This ascetic temper also explains why men did not revolt against social tyranny and

injustice. Every man is a replica of the *Brahman*. The *Brahman* is absolute and therefore beyond space, time and appearance. In consequence the indignities of the individual in empirical life could be ignored or explained away as mere illusions which would disappear on the cessation of this transitory life.

The impact of Islam shook this asceticism to its very foundations. Islam was essentially a religion centred upon this world and gave equal value to empirical and transcendental considerations. It brought a dynamic message of social democracy that few systems of existing political or social civilization could resist. It taught men that equality and fraternity must be realised in the life of day to day and could not be relegated to some remote and unearthly future. Like an explosive force it burst through the bonds and conventions which shackled the human mind. The oppressed and destitute responded to that appeal everywhere and co-operated in its victories. It was this message of freedom for the individual in his daily life that made the advance of Islam so swift and irresistible.

In the Vaishnava poetry of Bengal we find an artistic representation of this conflict and its resolution. Its central motif is love and its attitude towards love is an exquisite expression of the synthesis achieved. Love is not merely a physical or mental state. Still less is it a mere sensation. It is an eager and insistent urge of mind and body. It symbolises the creative power of society and the individual. The rationalist cannot explain it away. Those who seek to account for it in terms of biological necessity alone also fail. Perhaps it can be best understood as the individual's adventure

into the uncharted future from the certainties of his past and present. Activity is the essence of such adventure and the bolder the adventure, the purer the activity. Such activity frees itself from the bonds of purpose and is an expression of the sheer joy of life. The manifestation of such free and unpurposive energy constitutes pure play.

We find that all analyses of love finally lead to its conception as a mode of play. In Vaishnava poetry this is expressed as *Leela*—pure play of the spirit which is undetermined and indeterminate. This is, however, activity at its purest, but in the *Leela* of Vaishnava poetry, we still find traces of the old passivity of mind. We find that throughout the variations of emotion and sentiment, the poet is always a passive object of love. Nowhere is he the lover. Everywhere he is the beloved. This may at first sight seem inevitable, for the relation of the human soul to the ultimate reality must be one of subjection and surrender. This is, however, based on an illusion. On the level of common experience, the quest of the human soul for the infinite must take this form. From the point of view of commonsense, this quest is however symbolical and possesses merely metaphorical validity. When the quest ceases to be symbolic, and becomes the sole reality for the soul, we reach a level of experience where the distinction of subject and object is lost. It is no longer tied down to the commonsense conception of the human soul as dependent and limited. At such levels the difference between the lover and the beloved disappears. In Vaishnava poetry, the distinction persists. This shows that the philosophy of illusion has not been completely overcome. On the other hand,

the emphasis is on love as *Leela* or pure activity. This shows that the fatalistic conception of reality has been shaken to its very foundations.

This fusion seems to be the result of synthesis between the Hindu and the Muslim outlook on life. Most manifestations of the Indian spirit in the pre-Muslim period are tinged with a note of *mayabad*. Such a conception allows little scope for the development of individuality. The consciousness of difference between individuals is faint. The philosophy of *maya* helps to explain why men suffered the inequalities and indignities of life so patiently. Belief in rebirth is also a direct consequence of this attitude of mind. The theory of rebirth denies progress on the one hand and on the other, through its emphasis on the unity and equality of all life, pares away empirical inequalities. A conception which seeks to give the same value to insects and birds and beasts and men cannot consistently with its assumptions emphasise either progress or human superiority. Islam on the other hand insisted upon the superiority of man and declared him to be the lord of creation. He is subject only to the governance of God. This is echoed in the words of the Vaishnava poet who proclaims that man is the highest truth and there is nothing higher than this realisation.

We have seen the role which story-tellers and wandering minstrels played in the diffusion of culture in ancient India. They explain the pervasiveness of philosophy in different planes of society. A curious evidence of their power is provided by the development of the *Punthi* literature under the Muslims. Among the Hindus, the story-teller was never at a loss for the materials of his craft. He could draw upon the unlimited resources of

the Ramayana, the Mahabharata and the Puranic legends to delight, amuse and educate the people. This is the way in which the teachings of Hinduism were simplified for popular consumption and permeated the masses. Through the story-teller, the characters and incidents of Hindu mythology became common currency in the social and intellectual intercourse of the people.

The Muslim story-teller was at a comparative disadvantage, for the element of myth and legend is negligible in pristine Islam. He could of course relate didactic tales but the common man does not find delight in literature that is merely elevating. To live on the solid bread of religious instruction and moral homilies is dreary. Even miracles, without the sugar-coating of human interest to cover the core of theological need, soon pall upon the taste. The Hindu legends supply adventure and moral tales, escapades and intrigues, treachery and devotion and all the diverse strands which make up the complex pattern of human life. But the story-teller was not to be so easily foiled. If Muslim history did not supply him with a mythology, there was nothing to prevent his inventing one.

As in other fields, here also Akbar was perhaps the first to experiment in a conscious and systematic way. The process may have started long before his time, in all probability it did. The innovator we know is rarely an innovator. He is in most cases the man who succeeded where his predecessors had failed. In any case the story goes that it was Akbar who first commissioned his court wit, Birbal, to prepare a Muslim version of the Mahabharata. We all probably know the amusing but

slightly indecorous sequel. Birbal enjoyed the Emperor's munificence as long as he could and then presented him with a poser that proved fatal to the projected work : " The Mahabharata attributes five husbands to Draupadi. How many husbands would the Emperor like for his queen in his new Mahabharata ? And which among his courtiers should they be ? "

This story may be, and in all probability is pure fiction. But even legends conceal a core of fact and the story sums up for us a process that was real and continuous. The Mussalman must have felt the need of meeting Hinduism on its own ground. The story-teller was a missionary too powerful to neglect. Soon we find Muslim story-tellers and minstrels who compete on equal terms with their Hindu rivals. If the Hindu could sing of Rama and Lakshmana and their lifelong devotion to one another, the Muslim could retort with the deeds of Amir Hanifa, a legendary brother of Hassan and Hussain. Ali became a sort of mythical hero who combined in his person the roles of Bhima and Arjuna. Even the exploits of Hanuman, a monkey god and devoted worshipper of Rama, were not allowed to go unchallenged. The character of Amir Ummya was invented to serve as his counterpart. Hanuman is immortalised in popular imagination by the mighty leap with which he cleared the seas and went on to set Lanka on fire. Amir Ummya does not lag behind, for he too leaps through the air from shore to shore and is in his own way a valiant if unorthodox fighter. Even today, in villages and among large masses of the people, *Punthi* literature with its mixture of the grotesque and the heroic fulfils a function which in the case of corresponding classes

among the Hindus is performed by the Ramayana, the Mahabharata and the Puranas.

The religious skeleton of these tales is often the same all over India, but the clothing of flesh and blood differs from province to province. Just as Jesus is a valiant fighter in old Saxon poetry, a champion who delights in battle for its own sake, in India, too, we find that the legendary heroes change their character from province to province. Change of character is perhaps too strong a word. The general outline of the story must of necessity remain the same, but there is just the slightest change in nuance or shade which makes the hero the embodiment of the local outlook. Thus the Rama of Bengali folk-lore differs, however slightly, from the Rama of Tulsidas. Krishna in Bengal is the quintessence of a definite Bengali type. The heroes in the folk literature of the Mussalmans exhibit equally this tendency to provincialism. The Amir Hamza of Bengali *Punthi* literature is essentially a child of the native environment.

The similarities in the folk literature of the different provinces are not half so interesting as their differences. The latter indicate the peculiar social history of each locality and enshrine for us the customs and traditions which were built up through their peculiar circumstances. It is not without significance that the idea of a voyage recurs again and again in many ballads and songs of East Bengal. The hero is more often a merchant than a king, though in almost all other parts of India, the legends centre round a fighter or a prince. Gujrat is perhaps the only other exception but the exception itself is revealing. We read of merchant princes who assembled large fleets and sailed across the seas in quest of trade.

Adventures on the high seas, and in lands across the sea, the fate of wives and daughters who were left behind, the possibility of quick rise to wealth or sudden collapse of fortune—the story-teller was free to play on all the stops of human emotion. He would sometimes raise the hearts of his audience to ecstatic expectancy and then let them droop in the trough of dejection and despair. Something of the eager, adventurous and sea-faring life of the times was shared even by those who had never moved out of their villages.

The story-teller was often also a historian of contemporary manners. The social repercussions of the Muslim conquest were not confined to the capital or the military and aristocratic classes. Even in the villages, piquant situations arose and the story-teller did not hesitate to employ to the full the openings offered to him. The wars of the mythological heroes were fought again, and took a new significance in the light of current events. Religious themes were re-interpreted to suit modern needs, and changing customs enbalméd in the changeless medium of art.

Some of the aspects of the interaction of the Hindu and the Muslim elements in the evolution of Indian culture have been indicated above. The account must from the very nature of the case remain incomplete. When two powerful currents meet, there is no question of the absorption of the one in the other. The two streams join to create a new form. Their separate contributions can hardly be distinguished. The same thing happens when two living organisms unite. A new organism is born which shares the characteristics of the parents, and is yet a unique individual. Inter-

penetration is complete and no element can remain unchanged in the new synthesis.

This is what happened in the evolution of Indian culture in the middle ages. Old values were transmuted. Ancient themes were informed by the new spirit. We have referred to changes in the intellectual outlook and achievements in the fields of painting, architecture and poetry. These touch only a fringe of the problem, for the same story of synthesis is repeated in every sphere of life. The growth of a new language is by itself enough to demand the study of a life-time. The subtle changes in the tone and temper of Indian painting and music form an equally fascinating theme.

This integrating tendency is not new, for it characterised the development of ancient Indian culture as well. Integration and synthesis in the middle ages was possible because of the vitality of the cultures which participated in such process. Inert matter can be brought into juxtaposition but does not merge or blend into one another. It is only living spirits that can form a new unity. The adventure of the human spirit which started in this ancient land thousands of years ago has therefore never stopped. Indian culture underwent remarkable changes in the early period. When confronted with a foreign and developed culture, it absorbed the latter and grew richer in the process. The story is not yet over. The process of synthesis continues to this day. With the condensation of space and time it is bound to lead to still higher achievements of the human mind. In this capacity for renewal and infinite growth lies the secret of the unity and continuity of the culture of India.

MODERN FERMENT

A POWER of assimilation and synthesis has throughout the ages characterised the Indian spirit. We have seen its workings in the religious thought and social institutions of ancient India. It is equally manifest in the persistent efforts at the conciliation of conflicting tendencies during the medieval period. Civilisations with differing history and background were sought to be cast in one common mould. The genius of opposing cultures united to produce a rich and complex pattern of unrivalled beauty. Before the pattern could be completed, new and strange ingredients were introduced from a novel and unexpected quarter. In fact a new phase in the history of the world began with the appearance of the seafaring nations of Europe on the Indian scene.

Perhaps the most distinctive feature of the modern age is man's increasing use of science to control the forces of nature. Beginning about the seventeenth century, this has developed at an accelerated pace with every passing decade. Distance and physical obstacles have been largely overcome. New forms of energy have been harnessed to man's purposes. This has led to a completely new situation in human affairs. In the past, history was largely localised. Difficulties of communication retarded the movement of both men and ideas. Regional cultures could have flourished in comparative isolation in such a context but today this is no longer possible. Every region and culture

affects and is affected by every other culture and region.

Modern India is thus inevitably the focus of many forces. Science has transformed the earlier situation which enabled her to escape much destruction and suffering because of her location in one corner of the Eurasian continent. As if to underline this change, even the manner in which these new forces impinged upon her was new. Her previous contacts with the outside world had been predominantly by way of land. It was through land routes that succeeding races and tribes had poured into India. Her empires—except for a brief period of colonial expansion—had all been based on land. In fact, sea power had hardly ever entered into the calculations of her imperial rulers. She was therefore unprepared to meet Europe when it sailed across uncharted oceans and appeared on her unprotected coasts.

India has faced in the past many invasions and successfully overcome the challenge of new peoples and ideas. After the first shock of surprise was over, she set to assimilate the new forces which the European invaders had brought. The ferment that characterises much of her life today is evidence of her efforts in this direction. She knows that diverse cultural ideals and patterns have in the modern world been brought together in a manner where they must either find a common way of living or, with the appalling increase in the power and range of destructive weapons, share a common ruin. The history of modern India is the record of her renewed attempts to discover unity in all this diversity and achieve a new synthesis for herself and the world.

1. In the Melting Pot

WHEN Europe appeared on the Indian scene, the struggle between the various forces working there had achieved a temporary balance. The religious cults of the saints and mystics marked the attempt at rapprochement in one direction. The lessening of the rigours of caste marked it in another. The comparative economic and political stability of the country under the Great Mughals is evidence that a balance had been reached in these spheres as well.

It was, however, an unstable equilibrium. From the very nature of the case, the process of such synthesis can never be complete. Introduction of a single new element or the least shift in the relative importance of existing elements alters the balance and the changes which follow prove revolutionary. The advent of the West was a tremendous fact. It not only brought many new elements into the Indian cauldron but also disturbed the existing disposition of forces in Indian society. This released a mass of pent-up energy accumulated through centuries of strife and synthesis. Like the last stone which starts an avalanche, a process of change began which has not ended and whose future no one can yet foresee.

Each fresh incursion of race or idea had found the Indian temperament more malleable than before. This in a way accounts for India's capacity to hold in one

synthesis diverse creeds, customs and outlooks. The impact of the West, however, differed in certain important respects from all previous incursions. Till the advent of the West, new ideas and institutions had been brought by people who came to settle here. They were opposed to many elements in what they found, but the weight of numbers and the inertia of age-long custom bore them down. They were responsible for minor changes but the total effect remained unchanged and in time they lost themselves in the ocean of Indian humanity. Muslims were the only people who succeeded in resisting such submergence. Even in their case, the stamp of Indian culture differentiated them from the rest of the world of Islam. It is true that they also influenced the Hindu modes of life, but their primary influence was confined to urban areas. Life in the Indian villages flowed along the ancient channels with hardly any change.

The impact of Europe brought into being an entirely different set of conditions. Europeans who came to India had no intention of settling here. Some of them were for a time dazzled by the splendour of Indian civilization, but soon they insulated themselves against its influence. They remained alien by deliberate choice and built up their life in accordance with the pattern of their own land. For the first time, therefore, India faced a civilization which remained aloof and distant. Europeans were willing to give, but not to take, while Indians wanted neither to influence nor to be influenced. It was as if two closed systems faced one another upon the Indian soil. Absence of relation is, however, itself a kind of relation. The aloofness of the two peoples could not be absolute.

Interaction between the West and India was, therefore, inevitable, but it was at first an interaction mainly on the material plane. There were few, if any, contacts except in the field of trade and commerce. Goods were interchanged but not the concept of the good. Such a state, however, cannot continue long. Man is an economic animal, but he is also something more. Contacts which start through material interests develop into human relations. This soon happened with the Europeans who came to India. Historical accidents also helped the process. Through a strange irony of fate, men who had come for the lure of trade remained to rule the land. Political relations impinged upon economic contacts. The human aspect cannot altogether be denied even in relations that are purely economic. When economic contacts are strengthened by political ties, intercourse can no longer be kept confined to only the material plane.

India was just emerging from the stage of rural economy when expanding trade brought Europe to her shores. The family was still the centre of her life. Even today our social reactions operate mainly on the plane of the individual or the family. Individually Indians are one of the cleanest people in the world and yet our ideas of social cleanliness are lamentable. Scrupulously clean in our persons, we hardly notice the dirt and filth in our surroundings. Into this world of ego-centric social feelings, the West burst in with its growing capitalism and the concomitant development of a complex social consciousness.

It was inevitable that there should be profound and far-reaching changes in Indian modes of life. In fact,

a silent unplanned revolution has been taking place in Indian society for the last two hundred years. Destruction of old sanctions has been followed by the repudiation of old values. The structure of society has itself changed. Social groups which were dominant in the 18th century are today found reduced to the ranks of social pariahs. One significant example will prove the extent of the change. Before 1774, Muslims were economically, politically and educationally the dominating community of Bengal. Sir William Hunter went so far as to say that it was then impossible for a Muslim of good family to be poor or unemployed. All this was changed in the course of barely seventy years. Warren Hastings' policy of replacing Muslim revenue officers by Hindus started a process of impoverishment which was accelerated by the Permanent Settlement and the Resumption Proceedings. The Permanent Settlement deprived most of the existing land-owning families of their land. The few Muslim families that survived the Settlement were almost wiped out by the Resumption Proceedings. Macaulay's educational circular recommending the replacement of Persian by English completed the change. Again according to Sir William Hunter, it became almost impossible thereafter for a Muslim of good family to enjoy employment or wealth.

The change was not confined to any one community or any one aspect of life. All old values and beliefs were being challenged. Old forms of faith and custom were crumbling. Social, economic and political institutions were breaking up at a terrifying pace. India was literally in the melting pot. The old social stratification was disturbed. New types emerged which

have no parallel in any previous period. To the plethora of Indian faiths was added the militant Christianity of the western world. Bands of Christian missionaries not only proselytised but sought to influence where they could not convert. The restless European spirit brought everything under its scrutiny. On the one hand, the material conditions of life were profoundly changed. On the other, the buttresses of tradition and faith were undermined.

The process of revolutionary change was further hastened by man's increasing control over the forces of nature. This is perhaps the most significant fact in the history of the last one hundred years. Medieval India had tried to reconcile the elements contributed by different cultures and civilizations. New religions and philosophies which appeared from the fifteenth century onward are indications of such attempts at rapprochement. Hindu social forms are less rigid in the north than in the south. This is a measure of the extent of Muslim influence. The attitude towards caste is the most prominent aspect of the difference. In spite of all attempts the process of reconciliation was however never complete. The facts of distance and inaccessibility co-operated with the inherent rigidity of social forms to prevent a complete and uniform synthesis throughout the country.

When the material and religious influence of the European impact began to make itself felt, things were otherwise. Revolutionary changes had taken place in the means of social intercourse. Different sections and areas were increasingly knit together. Both geographically and culturally a process of compression

had begun. Interchange between the different types became more frequent and intense. In the past, men had changed their creed without changing their way of life. Now a process began by which men changed their way of life without changing their creed. This explains why the extent of Christian influence upon contemporary India is out of all proportion to the number of Christians in India.

The advent of Islam with its characteristic world outlook influenced mainly the Hindu aristocrats and town-dwellers. They however determined the tendency if not the tone of the whole of society. Partially counteracted by the vast distances of the country and the general immobility of the people, the impact of Islam had yet disturbed their inertia. When Christianity came, men were more willing and ready to accept its influence. The conquest of space and time through improved means of communication and intercourse minimised, if it did not solve, the problem of distance and immobility. The changes which the western modes of thought initiated did not stop in the towns. It filtered into the villages in ever widening circles of influence. A new leaven had begun to work.

If India had faced the challenge of the West as a free and independent land, the course of human history for the last two centuries may have been entirely different. Free and independent India would have judged western culture on its merits and accepted or rejected at will elements in it. A process of synthesis would have begun for building up the future civilisation of the world by combining their most valuable elements. History, however, decided otherwise. Political subjugation

compelled India to accept not what was suited to her genius but what her foreign conquerors imposed. They harnessed India to their own economy and forced through changes without regard to Indian interests. The old traditional pattern of social, economic and political life was disturbed and at times destroyed. Nor was there any attempt to build up a new and integrated outlook which would combine the heritage of the past with new ingredients brought from the West. Nature cannot, however, permit a vacuum. Haphazard and fragmentary beliefs and habits took the place of the old way of life. The old was destroyed beyond recall but the new remains still unborn.

2. *The Bifurcation*

THE DECISION to adopt western modes of education was in such a context momentous. The British took the decision for their own immediate political and commercial ends. Little did they realise that they were sowing the seeds of a revolution which has few parallels in history. Macaulay foresaw some of the consequences dimly but even he could not grasp their total implications. He thought that it would lead to the heightening of the tone of Indian life and in time to the substitution of western for Indian standards. There were Indians who were dazzled by their first acquaintance with western thought. With Macaulay they believed that one shelf of English books was worth the accumulated wisdom of the entire orient. Neither Macaulay nor his contemporaries realised that this was not a simple case of imposition of a European mould on the Indian mind, but a revivification of the Indian spirit which would in time create new forms of thought valid for East and West alike.

A factor which helped the quick assimilation of western modes of thought was that they were not wholly alien to the Indian soil. The filtering of Greek culture through Arabic and Persian channels had for almost eight centuries prepared the Indian mind. It was therefore peculiarly receptive to the same ideas when they were again presented in symbols of the West. Besides, the culture of

the West was itself composite. There were the Hebraic and the Hellenic strands woven into an indissoluble fabric. The Hebraic had its affinities with the Arab tradition. Even the Hellenic heritage came to Europe through an Arab medium. New and vivid evidence of the extent and depth of the Arab influence has come to light in the controversy over the contribution of Islamic eschatology in the conception of Dante's *Divina Comedia*. One may not accept Asin's view that the greatest of Christian poems was largely inspired by Muslim thought but no one can deny the generic influence of Arab culture on the outlook revealed in it. The Arab in his turn had incorporated in his science and philosophy elements borrowed from ancient India, and in course of time passed them on to Europe. All these elements, though in new and strange combinations, were brought back to India by Europe. Little wonder then that under the impact of western culture, revolutionary changes began in the Indian scene till all the old landmarks were swept away one by one.

The part played in this historical process by Christian educationists and missionaries cannot be ignored. The early missions contained men who dedicated themselves to the task of converting the people to Christianity. But more important than their religious influence was their influence upon the social mind of the age. They were the educators of youth. With the political and economic background sketched above, their message of western culture revolutionised the mentality of those who came into contact with them. Indiscriminate imitation and adoption of western habits led to excesses that were at times foolish and still inevitable in the

circumstances of the times. Everything Indian was discarded and young enthusiasts sought to suppress the whole of their racial and cultural past.

The period of blind and indiscriminate imitation did not continue long. Reaction was implicit in the human situation itself. The triumphs of European civilisation at first overwhelmed the Indian mind. As soon as the first shock of surprise had worn off, old habits of mind reasserted themselves. An old and proud civilisation like that of India could not be swamped or obliterated so easily. Clashes and conflicts between the different European nations helped in destroying the illusion of European superiority. Besides, closer acquaintance discovered many defects in European culture. Greater knowledge showed the existence of glaring social and political ills. Finer spirits from the West re-interpreted the culture of the East. Indian imitators of the West were confronted by European admirers of the East. Standards and values of East and West were compared in a more objective spirit. Historical research helped to restore balance and sanity by discovering the identity of the human mind in diverse surroundings. The first uncritical adoration of the West was followed by a mood of critical appraisal.

The infantile enthusiasm for all things European disappeared in course of time, but not till it had done one great damage to the Indian social fabric. The challenge to the old ideals was no loss but a definite gain. It compelled Indians to consider old problems anew and examine old truths in the light of new data. Unfortunately for India, the revaluation was at the cost of social unity. India's old culture had undergone

transformations in the past as well, but they were marked by gradualness and homogeneity. The whole of society had slowly evolved with changing times. The impact of Europe on the other hand led to a disruption of the social whole. A small minority responded enthusiastically to the new challenge. In fact it went so far as to seek to build up a new Europe on Indian soil. It discarded Indian traditions and sought inspiration in western ideals. The vast majority of Indians on the other hand clung to the past and remained almost impervious to the influence of the new civilisation.

The educational revolution brought about by Macaulay was largely responsible for this bifurcation of Indian society. The western modes of education were super-imposed on the country without any consideration of India's indigenous system or its needs. India had developed her own system of education in the course of centuries. It was attuned to her rural economy. It met the demands of her commerce and industry. It also served the needs of Indian administration and governance. Judged by prevalent standards, it was as progressive as education anywhere else. The majority of British administrators, however, desired a system of education that would serve best their purpose of exploiting India's resources. The old system of education did not pass this test, for what suited India did not suit her new and impatient conquerors.

It was the lure of trade that brought Britain to India. Even after the assumption of authority, trade remained for long the first British interest. Administration was long conducted with a view to commercial advantage. For full exploitation of the country's resources, Britain

needed a group of middlemen who could act as interpreters between her and the Indian people. The needs of administration also posed the same problem. Higher policy could be determined by the British themselves, but its application to the daily routine of administration required the services of indigenous men. The result was the creation of a large ministerial class who helped the British in administration and commerce. The primary qualification for such subordinates was proficiency in the English language. Education was therefore remodelled to suit the needs of the rulers. Instead of development of human personality, the chief aim of education became the attainment of linguistic proficiency in English.

It was inevitable that this new emphasis on linguistic efficiency should lead to a lowering of educational ideals. There was no organised system of technical education in medieval India. Even what little was taught through guilds or through apprenticeship now disappeared. Besides, the steady suppression of Indian industry and trade destroyed the incentive to technical education. Education became more and more literary and slowly Indians lost their manipulative skill.

Increasing emphasis on mere literacy also cut education adrift from the existing economy of the land. Skill in English was hardly necessary for agricultural or commercial purposes. On the other hand, such skill provided easy and soft jobs in Government or business concerns. The result is that agriculture, India's largest industry, is to this day manned by people who are hardly lettered. When an agriculturist takes to education, it is invariably as a preliminary to abandon-

ment of agriculture. Literate agriculturists are almost unknown and agriculturists who become literate soon cease to be agriculturists.

This divorce of education from the country's economy has resulted in increasing impoverishment. What is worse, it has introduced a new and dangerous division into Indian society. The problems of communal and provincial jealousy are in themselves serious enough. Still more serious is the problem of the widening gulf that today divides the educated from the uneducated classes in India. It would perhaps be more accurate to speak of the lettered and the unlettered classes than of the educated and the uneducated. We have already seen that India evolved a culture of the people which was relatively free of mere literacy. If this was true in the days when education was attuned to the life of the country, it was far truer during the period of foreign hegemony. For decades education was and still to some extent is divorced from the realities of Indian life and geared to serve the interest of a foreign exploiting economy. The divorce of modern education from the Indian context is still a fact which threatens danger to the country's life.

The new literate classes largely derive their ideas from the West. They also have in one way or another derived their living from the British connection. Commerce may promise glittering prizes, but the prizes are few and the competitors many. Service on the other hand promises security and sustenance. Compared to the sub-human standards which obtain all round, men in service enjoy relative comfort if not luxury. Their preferential position depends not so much on

character or innate ability as on superior linguistic skill. Such skill can however be easily acquired. Literacy in English has continually expanded in the course of the last century and led to an inordinate expansion of the middle classes. Some of the consequences of this disproportion of the middle classes are discussed later. One unwelcome feature however deserves special notice. The expansion of the middle classes meant more competitors for a limited number of jobs. Jobs could not keep pace with the increase in the numbers of the lettered. A good deal of the communal, provincial and linguistic jealousies in contemporary India may be traced to this disparity between the numbers of the literate and the avenues of livelihood open to them.

Of even greater danger in the long run is the weaning away of the literate classes from the culture of the country. Literacy generally leads to urbanisation and urbanisation means a break with the past. The rural peasantry and the urban intelligentsia tend to drift further from one another. Free flow between town and country has been disturbed. Today there is one way traffic leading to improverishment of the village and no corresponding enrichment of the town. Loss of contact is leading to loss of communication. The unlettered villager and the lettered townsman hardly speak the same language today.

The new literates no longer derive their strength from the age-long traditions of the land. Their outlook is western or more frequently pseudo-western. Cut off from their moorings, they are unstable, loud and factional. A deep sense of community has in the past characterised Indian life. This explains in part how India weathered

so many natural and human storms. The rural masses, especially the peasantry, exhibit today something of that sense of community life. They are unlettered, ignorant and superstitious, but their very immobility has in it an element of granite strength. Such qualities make for endurance but not for progress.

Thus we have on the one hand the masses that lack the power of initiative or expression but are possessed of a primeval strength derived from the soil. We have on the other hand an intelligentsia that is restless, eager and inquisitive. Like flotsam it floats on the surface of Indian life but has no roots in the life of the people. It yearns for progress but lacks the inner strength which can carry through great changes. Community between the masses and the intelligentsia would enable each to compensate its weakness by the other's strength. Instead of strengthening, the modern system of education tends to break the bond of that community.

3. *Geographical Nationality*

THE IMPACT of British capitalism brought with it an emphasis upon national consciousness. The first Europeans who came to India were eager to meet Indians on human terms. Soon this was replaced by a mutual aloofness that sundered all bonds of intercourse. In spite of physical contiguity, the two people are today separated by a vast mental distance. The nearer England came with improvement in the means of communication, the more the Englishman drew away from things Indian. The more the British withdrew into themselves, the more marked became their separateness from the people of the country.

Some of the earlier Europeans were eager to become Indians and some Indians were carried away by enthusiasm for everything British. After the British settled down into a separate caste, their separateness provoked reaction in the country. The legend of the solitary Englishman dressing for dinner was met by the myth of the inscrutable Indian who defied the bonds of flesh. The spiritual Indian was opposed to the material Englishman. The more the British emphasised their own nationality, the stronger grew the sense of nationality among Indians.

Emphasis upon the uniqueness of British nationality and culture necessarily provoked a consciousness of Indian nationality. Though the economic implications

of political subjugation were not always realised, a spirit of intense patriotism developed. From the former repudiation of everything Indian, the reaction led to a blind adoration of the past. Indian renaissance was often lost in mere revivalism. Nationalism served as a pretext for reviving old superstitions. Even today, we have not fully passed that stage. The curious amalgam of politics, religion and social superstitions that at times shocks scientific students may be attributed to this perverted nationalism. The idea of nationalism was borrowed from the West, and yet its development inevitably led to the repudiation of all things western. Western ideas had formerly served as the foci of new lines of development. They are now rejected simply because they derive from the West. Attention is often diverted from essentials and concentrated upon trivial externals that hardly matter.

Paradoxical as it may sound, capitalism with its political expression in imperial domination exaggerates the importance of nationality. Capitalism is based on the private ownership of the instruments of production. Private ownership leads to production for profit instead of production for use. The larger the scale of production the greater the room for profit. The logical sequel to the process of large-scale production is a tendency to world monopoly. The essence of modern capitalism lies in the capture and exploitation of foreign markets. The profits of such world-wide exploitation are however confined primarily to the possessing class. To divert the attention of the dispossessed among their own people, they exalt the idea of national unity. This has led to the growth of an exaggerated nationalism

among the European peoples. It conceals internal conflicts and maintains a facade of unity before the foreigner. The British have exploited national feeling with resounding success. Their attempt to apply it in the Indian context has led to startling developments.

A trend towards unity has throughout the ages governed Indian history. In the ancient period it led to the synthesis of diverse peoples and cultures in a hierarchical system. A unity of outlook developed which transcended racial and provincial barriers. The urge towards political unification also made itself felt, but it was counteracted by the vastness of the country and the absence of adequate means of communication. The lack of opportunity for intercourse fitted with the predominantly agricultural economy of the day. Together, they encouraged the growth of local autonomy. The Indian system of village republics has perhaps never been equalled. The unity of India therefore expressed itself through language and literature, custom and religion, art and philosophy, but could find no stable political medium.

The middle ages repeat the story with minor variations. Attempts at political unification continue. The old hierarchy of caste is slowly replaced by a new economic order. Social habits are profoundly changed. New experiments in art establish new modes of unity. Language, custom and dress change through the influence of new forces. Rival systems of religion and philosophy achieve new syntheses. A new leaven works throughout India and introduces a new consciousness among its peoples. The movement towards unity however remains incomplete. A composite culture is created but it

does not transform the core of Indian life. Diverse elements are held together but not merged.

We have already seen that India's geography was a most powerful factor for unity. Nature had marked out the land to be one. Her whole history has been an unfulfilled endeavour to achieve that end. Whenever political unification was achieved, the country was at peace with itself and the world. Attempts to divide the country into separate sovereign States have invariably failed. Equally doomed to failure has been the attempt to extend the frontiers beyond her natural boundaries. Indian history has, therefore, oscillated between two extremes. One limit was marked by the fragmentation of the land into many States. The other by attempts to expand beyond India's natural frontiers. Equilibrium has been achieved only when the forces of history and geography worked in unison.

In the past this balance could not be maintained. Lack of communications meant lack of control. With the imperfect methods of intercourse, it was impossible to maintain contact over so vast an area. Today all this has changed with our increasing control over the forces of nature. Railways opened out the country and brought the outlying areas closer to one another. The country was ringed in an iron hoop. Motor cars pushed the process still further and today, aeroplanes have almost solved the problem of distance within India. The post, the telegraph and the telephone have performed the same function in a different way.

For the first time in Indian history, conditions today exist for a stable political unity. This is not due to British occupation of India. The British would have

fared like former rulers but for the new-found control over the forces of nature. This enabled them to maintain contact with their motherland and aloofness from the people of India. As England drew nearer in time and distance, the Englishman felt less and less need of human contact with the Indian. Simultaneously it enabled him to build and develop a centralised State. The extent of the King's reach measured the extent of the King's power in former days. In modern times, the State can reach out to areas beyond an Alexander's dreams. And not only reach out, but keep constant touch and control. Modern scientific developments and the improvements in the means of communication make the organisation of India as one State not only feasible but necessary. The sentiment of unity can today find a political embodiment. It is not accidental that Indian national consciousness is a recent growth.

The idea of geographical nationality is therefore largely a recent development. Indians rarely before thought of themselves in terms of nationhood. There was a loose and tenuous unity of culture, but no unity of political organisation. The vastness of the country and the absence of modern methods of communication worked against political unification. Equally important was the absence of any sense of nationality in its modern meaning. Capitalism and the nation-state have developed side by side. That India is not a Nation State is another way of recording the fact that capitalism is for India still a development of the future.

The idea of nationality has profoundly affected the Indian consciousness. This disturbance is most pronounced in the minds of the younger generation and

specially among the students. They receive the impact of new ideas directly. Their mental resilience enables them to react to every influence brought to bear upon them. They are relatively free from the stabilising influence of vested interests. As students, they have not yet been fitted into the social framework in any specific form. They read of the glories of the western nation-state. It seems to them that the triumph of the West is due to its acceptance of the principle of nationalism. Infinite possibilities seem to open before them once India becomes a nation-state.

Western thought has also had an influence in increasing the emphasis upon democracy. It would be wrong to say that democracy was unknown to India. In the early village republic, India found a type of democracy which has rarely been excelled. Even the hierarchy of caste was originally an instrument of democracy. By emphasising function, it enabled an individual to rise in the social scale. This was however changed when birth, and not function became the basis of caste. Before the advent of Islam, Buddhism made the first serious attack on the citadel of caste. It did not fully succeed but left its mark on the Hindu social system. Changes occurred everywhere but the most far-reaching and persistent effects were felt in north-western and north-eastern India.

Islam's democratic challenge has perhaps never been equalled by any other religious or social system. Its advent on the Indian scene was marked by a profound stirring of consciousness. It modified the basis of Hindu social structure throughout northern India. In north-eastern India, its success was phenomenal.

One cannot escape the conclusion that the earlier impact of Buddhism was one of the factors which contributed to its overwhelming victory in the north-eastern regions.

And yet democracy could not be a decisive force in India's political life. The Indian intellect delights in the abstract and the universal. The individual hardly exists for it. This tendency to submerge the particular in the general is manifest in Indian religion, art and philosophy. Indian religions tolerate social inequity. The individual is but a fleeting embodiment of the Absolute and the Absolute can suffer neither indignity nor wrong. In Indian painting, we come across *the tree*, but rarely across a particular tree with an individual physiognomy and shape. Even human beings are stylized and stereotyped. In Indian philosophy, the particular has value only as a function of the universal. In a word, the Indian intellect emphasised the type and tended to ignore the individual.

. This indifference to the brute particular also explains why India missed the scientific temper and attitude. India threw up many individuals of great genius and they discovered important truths. There are brilliant anticipations of modern scientific theory but there was no science in the modern sense. Indifference to the individual is perhaps one of the major factors which prevented the growth of Indian science. Democracy is however nothing if not a recognition of the value of the individual. In India, democracy therefore worked within strictly defined limits. It could function in the village where personal relations softened the sharpness of abstract thought. Outside the range of

immediate and intimate contacts, it remained a mere bodyless idea.

The vastness of the country accommodated village democracy alongside autocratic imperialism. There was a good deal of local freedom, but it was tolerated rather than recognised. Whenever it came to a clash, compact military power triumphed over unorganised public opinion. The European emphasis on institutional democracy therefore brought something new to the Indian consciousness. What was also new was the increase in control over the forces of nature. Its most visible symbol was the improvement in the means of communication. The spirit of democracy now found a proper vehicle. At first through the railway train, and later through the country bus, equality invaded the countryside.

4. *The Conflict*

INDIAN nationalism swayed uncertainly between western modes of life and the old and superseded social forms. The uncertainty affected the mentality of the age. The disturbance was naturally greatest among the young. The process proved a continuing one, for the world was passing beyond the stage of nationalism. India was forced to experience simultaneously the phases through which European countries had passed in successive stages. We have referred to the abortive capitalism of India. Her nationalism and democracy were threatened with the same arrested development. Before she had fully evolved her nationality or her democracy, she was faced with the problem of organising her life in terms of social collectivism.

The development of capitalism leads to a demand for world monopoly. Monopoly raises questions about the distribution of its profits among the various members of society. A primitive rural economy can be centred round the family or the tribe. The father tills and the mother weaves and cooks. Children help in the field or house. Each family reproduces society in miniature. With growing specialisation and increasing skill in different types of work, the tribe or village takes the place of the family, but the life of the tribe or village still remains self-contained. It is only when trade and commerce develop beyond tribal limits that social

interdependence becomes sufficiently strong to colour communal psychology.

The first World War shook the basis of existing western culture. It revealed the contradictions inherent in nationality and capitalism in a naked form. New ideas captured the imagination of the intellectually alert. The profound disturbances in man's accepted beliefs and habits were climaxed in the socialist revolution of Russia. It is yet too early to assess its repercussions on the various forms of social life. The challenge to private property and the profit motive is however too great to be ignored by any type of society. The capitalist urge towards monopoly was brought to its logical conclusion. The purpose of the monopoly was at least in theory transformed from that of private benefit to social service.

The two World Wars have disillusioned young men all over the world about the possibilities of capitalism. The threat of unemployment and starvation is a strong reminder of the failure of the existing system. In India, it is not even full-fledged capitalism but a hybrid system under which the middle classes continually grow. They expand, but without assurance of either prosperity or security. Students who derive mainly from the middle classes are haunted by the spectre of unemployment throughout their student life.

The middle classes have everywhere started to realise that they have no future. In India, their plight is still more pitiable. The growth of capitalism has in other countries secured them a place in the social economy. In India, the expansion of indigenous capitalism was resisted by the British through political

and economic pressure. And yet, the relative comforts enjoyed by the middle classes continually attract recruits from other strata of society. A middle class has developed which is too numerous for support by the existing economy. Its members refuse to go back to a lower level of economic competence. And yet their march forward to capitalism is hampered in a thousand ways. Unemployment has increased and so has discontent.

The sense of frustration so often exhibited by Indian young men is a direct outcome of this state of affairs. Socialism with its ideal of social justice and equality of opportunity challenges their endeavour and their faith. The context in which they have to work and live seems far removed from the realisation of such a changed social order. The conflict between their aspirations and their surroundings provokes in the majority despondence and light-hearted flippancy. It is only in a minority that it challenges determined effort and striving. In the complex and often inchoate mentality of the young Indians of today, the three elements which cause the greatest ferment are the ideas of nationality and socialism and a sense of frustration and purposelessness.

The seeds of discontent and unrest spread far and wide and fell on congenial soil. This process was however disguised for a time. In the early stages, western education brought with it a guarantee of material success. The first reaction was one of uncritical adulation, but the phase of uncritical adoration could not and did not last long. The first flush of admiration wore away and simultaneously the pressure of economic

forces became insistent. Western education could guarantee material prosperity only so long as its votaries were sufficiently few to be absorbed in the economic system of the time. With increase in their numbers, a change in the economic order became imperative and yet the obstacles to any change were almost insuperable. The silent destruction of India's industrial life had long escaped attention but it could no longer be ignored. The increase in the numbers of the educated unemployed and the constant growth in the pressure on the soil were only symptoms of the growing malady.

The growing impoverishment of the country accompanied a demand for a better standard of life. It may sound paradoxical but its historical reasons are not far to seek. European capitalism had already started on its triumphant career when it came into close contact with India. How the Indian market accelerated the growth of that capitalism and sustained it is a story into which we need not enter here. Nor is this the occasion to trace the repercussions between political and economic forces. The operation of the same economic laws which brought England on the Indian scene led in their natural working to the political subjugation of India.

The immature and undeveloped industries of India faced the vigorous and hungry capitalism of the West. Indian industries were destroyed and the country forced back to the rural economy from which it was seeking to emerge. The reversion to an agricultural way of life coupled with enforced peace increased existing difficulties and created new problems. The population increased but the country was denuded of its wealth.

Land can never provide for the whole population adequately, except in societies that are still primitive in organisation. In India, the clock of civilisation was put back. At the same time, contact with the West revealed to the people a panorama of immense possibilities. The higher standard of material civilisation achieved by the West served as a challenge and an irritant. The growing impoverishment of the country added an element of bitterness to those who came into contact with the prosperous West. Better means of communication and the debilitation of the old social order made this discontent deep and widespread. A new spirit of unrest and inquiry permeated the country and the people.

Western ideas and the growing impoverishment of the country are two factors which sowed the seeds of discontent in the Indian mind. The increased facilities of intercourse and communication assured that the discontent would be deep and wide. The enforced arrest in the development of the Indian economic system further aggravated the situation. The break up of Mughal feudalism would, in normal circumstances, have led to the evolution of Indian capitalism. British capitalism served as a progressive force so far as it helped to destroy the prevailing order. It ceased to be progressive when it resisted, as in its own interest it was bound to, the free development of capitalism in India. The compromise through which it effected its purpose was the creation of an extremely strong middle class. It intended that this bourgeoisie should help in the distribution of British goods over the whole of India and still remain content with a mere fraction

of the profits earned by British capital. This the new bourgeoisie soon refused to do. It demanded not only a larger share in the profits but also a share in the British political and cultural heritage. Drawn from an ever-widening sphere, it not only circulated goods but also ideas. In time its mentality became the dominant factor in Indian social life.

The unbalanced growth of the middle classes is perhaps the most significant fact of modern India. Middle classes all over the world are restless, critical and individualistic. From the nature of the case, they are economically unstable. Impelled by the urge to move upward into the ranks of the capitalists, many of them are yet fated to relapse into the ranks of the proletariat. They feel they have to maintain a standard of respectability which is often beyond their means. This constant economic struggle colours their whole outlook on life. The aristocrat is so sure of his own standing that he feels no need to assert it. The proletariat also is apt to accept his lot. The middle classes refuse to be content and are often aggressive, self-assertive and loud. They seek to justify themselves by criticising others.

This temper of criticism in the middle classes extends not only to other groups or classes but also to themselves. For one thing, the middle classes can never be a homogeneous group. No social class is fully homogeneous, but stratification is even more marked in the case of the middle classes. At one extreme are those who just escape being proletariats. At the other are those who are hardly distinguishable from capitalists. Nowhere therefore is social snobbery so

rampant as among the middle classes. Every one is afraid and jealous of every one else. Individualism runs to excess and threatens to become a disease. The enlargement of the middle classes is, therefore, always a signal for the disintegration of the old social order.

The influence of the West has also in other ways accelerated the process of social change in India. The results have been at times paradoxical. The European social system with its divergence from Indian modes shook people's faith in the inevitability of any particular system. Repeated incursions of new races into India have compelled continual adjustments from the earliest times. The adaptive tendencies were however opposed by conservative forces. Threatened by war and at times alien forces, society grew a crust of orthodoxy as a measure of defence. The demands of a changed situation were opposed by a blind adherence to the past. Social progress and social inertia often worked at cross purposes. The lack of adequate communications weighted the scale in favour of conservatism, but with the improvement in the means of intercourse, the tendency towards change and progress was accelerated. This helped not only in the circulation of goods, but also in that of ideas. Towns were brought nearer the villages. Urban areas are always centres of nonconformity, scepticism and experiment. Villages are comparatively placid, credulous and orthodox. The impact of the towns on the villages has shaken the complacency of traditional modes of life.

5. *Eternal versus Momentary*

THE INCREASING intensity of the economic struggle has also helped to disturb the mood of contented acceptance. The old and easy ways of life are gone. Hereditary occupations can no longer guarantee the individual sustenance or comfort. New types of employment attract men from all communities and castes. The impersonality of the town has made intercourse between different groups easier. We are today witnessing a silent revolution taking place before our very eyes. Old moral ideas are changing beyond recognition. Caste—often regarded as the bed-rock of Hindu society—is itself breaking down. The old economic standards are gone. Changes in the material conditions of existence are bringing about profound changes in the mental outlook as well.

The impact of Europe has also forced upon India a new view of life and conduct. European modes of thought have been predominantly experimental. This has been in direct conflict with prevailing modes of thought in India. The worldly and pragmatic aspects of Hindu thought faded long ago. Even Islam has lost its militant rationalism in the Indian setting. European science on the other hand concerns itself with phenomena. It has sought to measure, understand and control what can be observed. The transcendental has been denied or at least ignored in its reckoning.

India's concern with the eternal has thus been confronted with British preoccupation with the momentary. India has ignored the present. Britain often neglects the future. For the Englishman, sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. He has neither the mind nor the time to think of future misery. The Indian on the other hand tries to think beforehand of all contingencies. In his anxiety to avoid future risks, he often lets present opportunity slip. India boasts of her clear and logical foresight. Britain takes pride in her capacity to muddle through. India's indifference to present misery in the hope of future reward has found in the British attitude its direct antithesis. The triumph of the worldly and experimental attitude of the British has made Indians question and re-examine the trend and basis of their own thought.

The social flexibility which is beginning to be evident on all sides is one expression of a growing empirical outlook. This was precisely what India lacked at the time of Europe's advent. A rigid dogmatism had taken the place of easy adaptation to changing circumstances. Adaptation is the law of life and can be resisted only at peril of death. Loss of adaptability meant the loss of power to survive. Indian society under the later Mughals was therefore threatened with internal dessication. The victory of Europe was only an outward symbol of inner decay. Impact of European modes shattered the old rigidity and compelled a revaluation of old standards. European ideals were very different and could not yet be lightly dismissed in view of their dazzling triumph. The clash of ideals engendered an attitude of enquiry and

criticism, though its objectives are yet uncertain and indefinite.

Questions are the cutting edge of knowledge. Without enquiry there can be no growth. Questions and enquiry are therefore essentially the mark of youth. The restoration of a critical spirit has thus meant a rejuvenation of India. Rejuvenation has its attendant dangers. Adolescence tends to deny everything it finds. It dreams of shaping the world anew. It does not discriminate between what to preserve and what to reject of its social heritage. Its criticism is often directed at the externals while the fundamental weaknesses remain untouched. Rejuvenation may exhibit adolescent characteristics in an even more marked degree.

If the ferment in Indian life is not to degenerate into mere anarchy, our problems must be approached in a spirit of calm and searching analysis. Reason alone can build a heritage for the delight and pride of future generations out of the crumbling ruins of the Indian past. The role of reason is the more important because of the extraneous factors that have intervened. Consciousness of political subjugation has made our people peculiarly susceptible to offence. Misinterpretation of Indian history has created misunderstanding and bitterness among the communities. Criticism which is perfectly justified is often resented because of the source from which it emanates. The confusion of renaissance and revivalism further complicates the picture. Communalism and extreme radicalism are blended to charge the atmosphere with passion and prejudice.

Blind rejection of the West is today the prevalent temper of an important section of Indian society. This

was a natural reaction from its blind imitation in the past. The denial of a wrong is not however equivalent to the assertion of the right. Blind and indiscriminate denial of the West would harm India more than the West. Values of great importance to India stand in danger of being unnecessarily sacrificed. If this tendency holds, India may again be dissociated from the general current of the civilisation of the world. Dissociation means isolation and isolation stagnation. India can attempt dissociation from the massive march of world forces only at her peril.

Nor would such an attempt at putting the clock back succeed. In the modern world of interlacing connections, isolation is impossible. Attempted isolation will only lead to economic and political disaster. Instead of being a conscious and active participant in world processes, India would then become a plaything of forces over which she would have no control. It is easy to understand the reluctance of the average Indian patriot to accept the values of the West. To him they must bring memories of cultural imperialism and national humiliation. To deny the superiority of the West where the West is in fact superior is neither sensible nor safe. Nor is it of any use to exalt Indian elements simply because they are Indian. Inferiority complex often expresses itself through an exaggerated assertion of superiority. Acceptance of values wherever found and their absorption in the national heritage is the surest sign of national health and sanity.

6. *Art and Literature*

MODERN India looked at the West through English spectacles. It is therefore English thought which has primarily influenced us, or at most, Western thought so far as it has been assimilated and transmitted by the British. It is often said that the greatest gift of England to India has been the English language and literature. That this is largely true cannot be denied. British influence on our dress, habits and social customs has been small. The changes wrought in our intellectual and spiritual make-up have on the other hand been far-reaching.

It is true that the English language has given us some access to other European literatures. But we have so emphasised the importance of English that we tend to underrate everything else. Other European literatures have their own characteristics. They do not easily fall into English moulds. Our efforts to apply to them English tests therefore fail. We even try to look at Eastern literatures with English eyes. The results are at times both pathetic and grotesque. We forget that we can never become fully English in our thought, sentiment and outlook. At best we can only become imitation Englishmen and imitators are debarred from citizenship of the world.

One peculiarity of the British influence may be noted here. The British are in their social habits and personal

relations one of the most reserved peoples of the world. The cool phlegmatic Englishman has become proverbial. Caution and restraint characterise the personal and social life of Englishmen. Emotions are held in leash and even suppressed. Napoleon saw in them a nation of shopkeepers who weighed out things with minute scales. This is however a one-sided picture, for the repressed emotions force an outlet in their art. Passion leaps to fantastic heights and makes English poetry one of the most intense in the world.

This peculiarity of British character and art has at times led us to a misunderstanding of literary values. Human emotion is only one of the ingredients of literature and not its end. The clarity which characterises literature in the Latin languages is rare in English. This has also influenced our reaction to peoples other than the British. We seek to judge the heartiness of Americans by British standards of social propriety. We expect in French rationalism or Chinese economy the emotional exuberance found in English poetry.

The development of indigenous literatures began even before the advent of the British. Bengalee poetry had reached considerable maturity under the Pathans and the Mughals. The devotional poetry of Maharashtra is of lasting value and interest. Kabir and his followers reached great heights in experience and expression. The Ramayana of Tulsidas still remains a household book. What the British did was to release new social forces and precipitate a literature that is wider in range and novel in spirit.

The changes in the economic and social structure of the country helped in this process. We have seen

how the old stratification was disturbed in Bengal. The expansion of the middle class carried with it an expansion in leisure. It also created both a demand and an opportunity for art. The system of permanent land tenure brought into being a middle class which continually grew. Economically it ruined Bengal by discouraging initiative and diverting capital from commerce and industry into land. Socially it created a system of vested interests which blocked the progress of the country as a whole. Politically it acted as a buffer which stood between the impoverished people and an exploiting imperialism. In the field of art alone did it prove fruitful and creative. Bengal's expanded middle classes threw up a series of literary men unequalled in modern India and culminating in a world figure like Rabindranath Tagore.

The excitement of acquaintance with English poetry helped in the flowering of Bengalee literature. Yet it would be too much to say that this excitement by itself was responsible for the new renaissance. The soil was prepared by the economic, social and political changes brought about by the invasion of European capitalism. It was only in this background that the influence of English poetry proved decisive. We have referred to the intensity of English aesthetic experience and expression. English poetry is marked, not so much by balance and reticence which make for decorum and social order as by an emphasis upon individual feeling and emotion. The rugged individualism of the Englishman has been noted in other fields as well. Each Englishman thinks of his home as his castle over which he claims absolute sway. This individualism is also characteristic

of the middle-class and British civilisation has been typically bourgeois.

The undue expansion of the middle class created conditions for the disintegration of old Indian social forms. A new desire for liberty and a sense of revolt against authority stirred the younger generations. A new note of individualism, revolt and scepticism was discernible in the national character. The new temper found in English poetry with its emphasis on individual liberty the embodiment of its own faith and hope. Nowhere was the new ferment so strong and extensive as in Bengal. The poetry of Bengal since the advent of the British is marked by a new note of individualism, revolt and scepticism. The note of individualism continually deepens till the poet felt alone in an alien universe. The pathos and solitariness which characterise much of the poetry of Tagore is an expression of this spirit. The process continued and a stage was reached when the individual felt separate not only from other individuals but lost the unity of his own personality. This loss of integration is not confined to Bengalee poetry alone but has its counterpart in most contemporary Indian art.

The emphasis upon the individual tends to loosen social bonds. Customs and traditions act as a cement which binds together the community. The condition for social integration is that the individual surrenders to the purposes of the social group. When the individual exalts himself above society, old social patterns begin to crumble. A curious reflex of this process of social disintegration is often seen in a sudden efflorescence of literature and art. All forms of art are the expression

of individuality. The final condemnation of a work of art is to call it commonplace or general. A social milieu in which traditions are sacrificed to individuality therefore often creates the background for a flowering of art. It is not accidental that the enlargement of the middle classes in India has been accompanied by an outburst of experiment in many forms of art.

It is also significant that in all modern manifestations of Indian art, there is a curious absence of great architecture, and one may add, great drama. Nor is this due to any deficiency in the Indian character. Past memorials testify to the feeling for beauty which informed the Indian mind. The complexity and intricacy of south Indian temples are matched by their solidity and grandeur. The wonderful lines of the Mughal mausoleums are the despair of architects all over the world. It is only in recent times that the Indian feeling for massive form has failed to find adequate or significant expression. The reason must be sought in the nature of architecture itself. We must similarly seek in the nature of drama the explanation why Indians who produced great dramatic literature in the past have failed to do so in recent years.

Of all forms of art, architecture is most dependent on a social feeling for beauty. The poet can launch into individual voyages after the ideal. The painter also may achieve perfection in isolation. Music may transcend the individual but has its origin in individual ecstasy. Architecture must depend on social factors at every stage. Only the co-operative endeavour of many can build up great architectural monuments. Not only the master builder but his associates must have a feeling for craftsmanship. The whole of society

must be informed by a sense of common purpose and endeavour. It is only when there has been a deep communal sense that great architectural monuments have been raised. The Gothic churches of Europe, the rock temples of south India or the great mosques of the Saracens are all visible symbols of a unified society at peace with itself. Whenever social solidarity has been sundered, architecture has been the first form of art to suffer. Drama has for similar reasons flourished only when the whole of society had been fired by common and accepted ideals.

7. *The Young Rebels*

A CHARACTERISTIC which compels attention in contemporary India is the attitude of defiance among the younger generations.' This is not confined to any class, community or area. A tidal wave of rebelliousness has swept through the land and affected men and women in every sphere of life. The proverbial docility of the Indian peasant has either already disappeared or is disappearing fast. Indian labour now demands and often exacts a human standard of life and treatment. The Indian student has lost the tradition of submission and respectfulness. Women are clamouring for equal rights with men. In a word, the younger generations are on the march and recognise none of the sanctions or the privileges of the past.

To older generations and persons in power, this rejection of authority often appears as mere turbulence and indiscipline. It provokes regret and at times horrified anticipations of India's gloomy future. There is, however, no historical justification for the attitude of the older generations. Old political ideas have crumbled. Old social standards have lost their compelling force. The old economic system has been shattered beyond repair. Even religion can no longer console as in the past. In every sphere of thought and action, there is uncertainty, doubt and hesitation. With old landmarks swept away,

it is not surprising that Indian youth is restless and at times even turbulent.

The perturbation of the older generation is not however strange or unexpected. They were brought up in a society based on the concept of authority. Status governed both political and economic relations and status was immutable as the order of nature itself. Even religion contributed to the maintenance of the *status quo* by its emphasis on revelation and sanction. Islam's revolutionary democracy shook that edifice of sanction and authority but could not demolish it. The emphasis on the finality of revelation encouraged authoritarianism within Islam itself. The conservative and authoritarian tendency was still more marked in Christianity. In a word, all the religions in India combined to buttress the authoritarian structure of society. Those who were brought up in such an atmosphere missed the silent and unobtrusive changes in their surroundings. It was only when the process was almost complete that they realised with a shock the difference between the old order and the new.

There was another reason for the passivity of the traditional Indian outlook. Imperialism is incompatible with the rejection of authority. In India the advent of a new religion was accompanied by the establishment of a new empire. In the earlier period, the rise and fall of Buddhism and Brahmanism fluctuated with the fortunes of rival imperial dynasties. In the middle ages, the spread of Islam was accelerated by the establishment of Muslim power in Delhi. In more recent times, Christianity has followed in the wake of British domination of India.

When Islam or Christianity first came to India, neither had a trace of military power attached to it. They, however, became important only after the establishment of military domination by their followers. This fact had the unfortunate effect of confusing material and spiritual influences. The inner meaning of Islam was hidden by the political machinations of rival Muslim kings. Christianity tended to be identified with the morality of the British ruling classes. Religion thus became associated with an imperial regime and no imperial regime can tolerate the growth of a critical intellectual outlook. Education fashions the minds of men and determines the temper of both individuals and society. Both the imperial systems have therefore based education upon the idea of unquestioning acceptance and discouraged enquiry and criticism.

Recent years have seen a silent but profound alteration in this background. Scientific discoveries outmoded old methods of production and distribution. The use of machinery compelled large-scale production and demanded far-flung markets. A revolution in the methods of production was therefore followed by a revolution in the means of communication and intercourse. Religion and cultural tendencies acquired a new and expanded influence. As the interchange between town and country grew, the influence of the town continually increased. Towns on the whole have always been centres of ferment and change. Increase in the importance of the town therefore introduced a new dynamic in society. Inter-course through the railway, the post office and even more the printing press broke down social and religious barriers and further undermined the sway of authority.

Simultaneously, the growth of the middle class brought with it the prevalence of a rebellious and anarchic mood. This also worked against the old traditions of authority. The people, specially the younger among them, grew more responsive to new and alien influences. Political and economic forces operated against one another and introduced a new disequilibrium. The new imperialism demanded an enlarged middle class but would not yet permit the growth of indigenous capitalism. This fundamental contradiction expressed itself as the political discontent of an intellectually alert minority. Soon it pervaded the whole of society as a spirit of unrest and rejection of old values.

The ebullience of spirit in contemporary India is therefore a symptom of the times. The historical forces which are shaping the destiny of India challenge the authoritarian basis of society and education. The first flush of intellectual emancipation leads to excesses in every sphere. Reactions are equally violent and oscillation between extremes still continues unchecked. It is inevitable that a transition from the attitude of mind based upon acceptance of authority to one based on reasoned equality should be marked by uncertainty, unrest and upheaval.

The transformation is the inevitable result of a long process of transitional changes. Nor are the changes sudden or accidental. A long period of silent and unobtrusive preparation went on unnoticed. The change when it came shocked only those whose mental and social habits had become ossified. We must not, however, exaggerate the extent of the change. Social habits are changing, but social beliefs are still largely

unchanged. The attitude of criticism and intellectual examination is still extensive rather than intensive. Modern moods mingle strangely with anachronistic feelings. Contemporary Indians think, feel and act simultaneously on many planes. The past, the present and the future are telescoped in strange patterns that baffle analysis and understanding.

8. *Renaissance and Revivalism*

THE CONFUSION of nationalism with obscurantism in modern India has often attracted notice. A phenomenon still more curious is the amalgamation of doctrinaire socialism with sectarian communalism of an extreme type. The demand for social justice forms the basis of all socialist theories. In India this is abstracted from its own context and distorted to suit the purpose of vested interests who use communal passion to serve their own ends. The plea for communism no longer serves as a cementing bond to knit together the various sections of the exploited classes. Through intrusion of extraneous religious considerations, it becomes instead a guarantee for maintaining the iniquities of the existing social order.

Renaissance and revivalism are therefore working at cross purposes in modern India. Traditional moorings have been destroyed. The former attitude of acceptance can no longer serve as basis of India's social life. The old security of life has been shattered. With it have gone the old and familiar ideals of life. The growing inter-lacing of world affairs renders all attempts at maintenance of isolation or equanimity futile. Men with whom we neither have nor can have any personal contact determine the courses of our life. Decisions which have nothing to do with our hopes and demands decide between life and death for us. It is small wonder

that there should be manifestations of unrest and even indiscipline among all sections of the people.

Unrest and ferment are therefore characteristic of contemporary India. Her ancient people are on the march. Her ideals have not yet been defined but there are everywhere the stirrings of a new birth. Far-reaching changes in the Indian scene have taken place throughout the ancient and the medieval periods. They did not however create the impression of the sundering of the old ties. Changes which have taken place during the last two centuries, and especially within the last three or four decades are however of an altogether different order. They seem almost unrelated to the past and bear all the marks of an entirely new beginning.

The impression of utter novelty is no doubt wrong. Present phases are the culmination of a process that began long ago and has persisted through centuries. Nevertheless the impression of break with the past cannot be denied. Nor is this peculiar to India alone. Changes which have occurred during the last three or four centuries have made a greater difference to human life and culture than the changes which occurred in the whole of previous recorded history. In fact, the pace of change has been accelerated at a terrifying rate since the beginning of this century.

The modern period has not only seen accelerated changes, it has also seen unification on a scale and degree never experienced before. There have been many civilisations before, but there has hardly ever been a world civilisation. Ancient Indian civilisation was primarily the concern of India. Roman civilisation was

confined mainly to the Mediterranean basin. Chinese civilisation had little influence outside its immediate orbit. In spite of its wider spread, even Arab civilisation was regional rather than terrestrial. In fact, the material conditions for a truly world civilisation did not exist. With the conquest of nature, conditions have for the first time been created for a civilisation that can function on a global scale.

The most notable feature of this global civilisation is the passion for social justice. It challenges the sway of exploitation and imperialism. It attacks social inequality and inequity at their very base. Its instrument of attack is the machine which liberates human energy and creates the possibility of leisure for every human individual. The enslavement of nature for the first time in history makes unnecessary the enslavement of man. All intellectually alert men and women dream of a new order of society. This new vision is the result of man's new-found control over the forces of nature.

The control over the forces of nature has opened out vistas that were beyond man's wildest dreams in former times. The poorest citizen today has at his command resources that were denied to the proudest potentates of the world. The common man can enjoy a standard of life which was beyond the reach of the most powerful of kings. Luxuries of former times have become the barest necessities of today. And all this can be achieved on a truly world scale. The extension in scope and opportunity holds not only within countries but among countries as well. What was formerly the prerogative of a small section in a

particular country is today available for the whole of mankind all over the world.

Extension of civilisation is potentially world-wide today but so also is disaster to civilisation. Formerly, the decline of a civilisation meant the decline of a section within one country. There was the possibility that other sections in that country or at least in other countries would take up the torch of civilisation and maintain human progress. Through the increasing conquest of space and time, revolutionary changes in the methods of warfare and attack, transformation in the means and scale of production and distribution, and the growing integration of the social and economic life of different regions of the world, that possibility has today disappeared. One world is in the process of establishment if it has not already been established. Its fate is also therefore bound to be one. Like freedom and peace, progress for the world is also today indivisible.

Conflicts grow out of a sense of wrong. If the roots of conflict are not removed, the whole structure of world civilisation must come down with a crash. Two world wars in the course of twenty-five years are a sharp reminder of that danger. They have already shown how imperialism, in spite of frantic endeavour after compromise, cannot achieve a permanent equilibrium. Economic exploitation and the attendant sense of wrong are inherent in the nature of imperialism. They cannot be removed without the liquidation of imperialism itself. The ideals of justice and the need for survival combine in demanding a new orientation of society.

Indian independence is the first step towards such reorientation. Dependent India means not only servile

India but sullen India. It means the failure to utilise her vast material and human resources. A stringent economy means a disturbed society. Indian society is today explosive because of the stringency of her economy. What appears on the surface as communal or provincial jealousy and discord are at bottom efforts to survive. India's industries have been destroyed. Indian agriculture cannot support her increasing population. Service alone seems to offer security and comfort. There is therefore an unhealthy competition in securing service as a means to survival. In the struggle for existence, every individual and group uses the weapons readiest at hand. Vested interests can squeeze out luxury even out of the existing regime. A millionaire whatever his race or colour can always command the good things of life. Communal cries serve to divert the attention of the exploited masses from glaring inequalities. Communalism is the last defence of vested interests.

Attention may be thus diverted from glaring evils but the problems are not solved. Communal passions rankle in the mind. Social ties are loosened. The order and decorum built up through centuries of effort and restraint are endangered. Civil society is like an embankment that contains the surging tide. So long as the embankment holds, the tides rage in vain. Once there is the slightest fissure, not only is the whole embankment threatened but also the countryside it protects. Similarly with the restraints built up by civilisation. Once they are loosened, the way of life they protect is in danger. What may start as a communal riot ends as civil strife. Civil strife soon develops into international war. With the modern

weapons of destruction and death, international war presages the end of human civilisation itself.

The problem of Indian independence is therefore no longer a problem for India alone. The current of world events beats on India's shores. She is caught in the movement towards unity and integration and cannot escape her fate. Political subjugation however makes her more a passive object for world forces than an active agent on the world scene. This is instinct with danger to herself and the world. It is a threat to world peace as her subjugation and exploitation tempt powers other than her exploiter. It is full of danger to herself as it prevents her full, free and natural development. Suppressed and embittered, she is not only full of conflicts within herself but a source of infection to the world outside. A free and peaceful India would be a bastion for world peace. Not only would she stabilise and secure the ferment in Asia and Africa but also throw her powerful weight on the side of forces working for global peace.

With her complex and continuous culture of many centuries, India has rich gifts to offer to the world. The impact of the West has awakened her from age-long slumber. A new spirit of youth breathes in her ancient limbs. New questions stir in the depth of her consciousness. The clash between the eastern and the western outlook provokes in her a new religious and social awakening. There are not only new quests for spiritual truth but also new relaxations of old social tyrannies. Throughout the nineteenth century, one reformer after another appeared on the Indian scene. Their influence has however remained on the surface and never penetrated

to the depths of Indian life. The same story is repeated in the political and economic fields. The old patterns have been destroyed, but as yet there is no guarantee of a new and resplendent birth.

In the field of art alone has contemporary India built up memorials worthy of her past. Art is, however, essentially a quest of the individual in the solitariness of his spirit. Architecture or the theatre, where art is communal, remains unborn in modern India. Even in painting and poetry, the solitary spirit tires if it cannot continually replenish its energy from the depths of the racial mind. Indian poetry and painting flourish like the cactus on the shallow beds of earth on the hill-sides. They are brilliant but remain exotic and strike no roots in the people's soul.

The failure of India to attain her poise is most marked in the realms of philosophy. Philosophy examines the postulates of existing beliefs. It subjects to scrutiny the established bases of civilisation. In a word, it is man's criticism of the presuppositions of his own faith. For philosophy to flourish there must be an established civilisation and culture. Where civilisation is in the process of disintegration and culture in the melting pot, it would be idle to expect philosophy to develop. The paucity of Indian philosophy in the last three or four centuries is evidence of the sterility of Indian culture and civilisation during that period.

There are however signs of a new birth on all sides. The ferment and unrest in all spheres of Indian life and thought are evidence that a new world is taking shape. Stars must collide and break into fragments before a new sun can be born. Ancient India was remarkable

for her spirit of synthesis and reconciliation. The modern world is instinct with the urge of a new and impatient life. To the old tradition of unity of life has been added the new demand of equality and justice. Old values and new must clash in India before a new humanity can emerge. This ancient arena of the world is again the battle-field of conflicting forces. Young men in India must play their part worthily in that process. They must preserve elements of value from the decaying civilisations of the past. They must formulate the new demands of the emerging world civilisation. Theirs is the task of achieving a new synthesis in which the heritage of the ancient, the medieval and the modern world will be reconciled and enriched.

July, 1946

Post-script

WITH the advent of independence a new chapter has begun in India's long story. For almost nine centuries the process of growth among the Hindus and the Muslims was one of contact, assimilation and synthesis. The first effect of the entry of the West was to start a process of dissociation between the two communities. The common culture built up through a millennium seemed to be in danger of dissolution. Among both Hindus and Muslims, there was an attempt to resuscitate the original form and pattern of their respective cultures. This was encouraged—sometimes consciously, perhaps more often unconsciously—by the British rulers of the day. As the day of Indian freedom drew nearer, the hopes and fears of the two communities were aggravated. We need not go into the troubled and sorry history of the conflicts and intrigues of recent decades. It is enough to say that they ultimately led to a partition of the country and the emergence of two separate States.

The silent revolution which has been taking place in India for the last hundred years or more culminated in the achievement of political independence. The whole of this period was characterised by unrest and ferment. Sometimes, the new awakening found expression in mere revolt against all accepted standards. Sometimes, it expressed itself in works of art or movements of religious or social reform. Common to all

manifestations has been a spirit of enquiry, if not revolt. Such discontent was in itself evidence that a new birth was taking place.

The process of ferment, unrest and disintegration has, if anything, been enhanced since the attainment of independence. The stirring of the spirit which brought about independence has not ceased. New equilibria—whether in the political, the economic or the social field—have not yet been established. There are nevertheless indications that the remarkable spirit of synthesis and conciliation exhibited by India in the past is still active. In the past, her toleration was at times indistinguishable from passivity and quiescence. Modern India is instinct with the urge of a new and impatient life. Everywhere there are the stirrings of a new world.

India's economic life is being reconstructed from its very base. In place of the economy of want which has prevailed till now, India is seeking to establish an economy of plenty where everyone may serve according to his capacity and receive according to his needs. India has learnt from the experience of western Europe under *laissez faire* and of eastern Europe under centralised dictatorship. For herself, she is seeking to establish a balanced economy where there will be scope for both public planning and private initiative. More and more of the basic industries are to be brought under national ownership and control. A wide field of secondary and tertiary industries dealing with consumption goods is however to be left to the private sector. India is thus seeking to establish a mixed economy. Simultaneously, she is experimenting how small-scale and cottage industries can be fitted into

a plan which provides for the production of power and capital goods under factory conditions.

Politically, India has elected to be a democratic Republic. Liberty of speech and action, thought and belief is guaranteed to all citizens. Inequalities based on privilege are being liquidated. Till conditions of equality are established, special measures are being adopted to help the underprivileged. The people are becoming increasingly conscious of their dignity and obligations. The State seeks to provide welfare services while guaranteeing the freedom of the individual. Equal concern for general welfare and individual liberty is characteristic of India's internal affairs. The combination of the two ideals is her most significant contribution to foreign policy. India's international importance is due to widespread recognition that such a pattern is an urgent need of the modern world.

Developments in the field of politics and economics are important. The resurgence of Indian arts and crafts has also led to intensive activity in many fields. Old cultural contacts are being revived and new ones formed. The most significant expression of resurgent India is however to be found in her attempt to reconstruct her rural life. For centuries nothing changed in the villages. Immediately before the attainment of independence, conditions in villages were at times indistinguishable from conditions three thousand years ago. Today there is a colossal effort to transform the entire countryside. Roads are being built where none existed before. Schools have been opened in remote areas for the first time in recorded history. Irrigation is bringing water and new life to millions of acres of

parched land. Health and sanitary services are for the first time being planned on a national scale. Every effort is being made to make up for the neglect from which villages have suffered for centuries.

New modes of cultivation, new forms of irrigation, new facilities for communication and transport, new and better schools and hospitals are literally transforming the countryside before our very eyes.

Significant as these developments are, what gives them still greater value is the spirit in which the people are responding to the challenge of new tasks. Programmes of reconstruction have no doubt often been initiated by the State, but the volume of response from the people has been massive. In the past, there has generally been a tendency to look to the authorities for all measures of reform. Today, the people themselves are increasingly taking the initiative in formulation as well as execution of schemes. A new upsurge of life is sweeping through rural and urban areas. The inertia associated with the village has vanished. In village and town, the ancient people of India are again on the march towards a new goal of social security, social justice and individual self-realisation.

15 August, 1955



s. Vastav

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY,
NEW DELHI
Issue record.

Catalogue No. 901.0954/Kab-3731

Author— Kabir, Humayun.

Title— Indian heritage.

Borrower No.

Date of Issue

Date of Return

"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book
clean and moving.